

R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 002 949

24

MEN AND WOMEN AS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS.

BY- GROSS, NEAL TRASK, ANNE E.

HARVARD UNIV., CAMBRIDGE, MASS., GRAD. SCH. OF EDUC.

REPORT NUMBER CRP-853-2

PUB DATE JUN 64

CONTRACT OEC-SAE-8702

EDRS PRICE MF-\$0.63 HC-\$16.60 415P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SEX (CHARACTERISTICS), SEX DIFFERENCES,
*PRINCIPALS, ELEMENTARY SCHOOL SUPERVISORS, PUBLIC EDUCATION,
URBAN SCHOOLS, *MALES, *FEMALES, CAREER CHOICE, OCCUPATIONAL
INFORMATION, BACKGROUND, PERFORMANCE FACTORS, GROUP BEHAVIOR,
*SCHOOL ADMINISTRATION, STATISTICAL SURVEYS, ADMINISTRATIVE
PERSONNEL, SOCIOLOGY, CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS

THE BACKGROUNDS, CAREERS, AND PERFORMANCE OF MEN AND WOMEN AS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WERE EXAMINED TO RELATE SEX DIFFERENCE TO THE FUNCTIONING OF THEIR SCHOOLS. THIS REPORT REPRESENTED THE SECOND OF SEVERAL MONOGRAPHS THAT PRESENTED THE FINDINGS OF THE NATIONAL PRINCIPALSHIP STUDY, "A COMPREHENSIVE INVESTIGATION OF THE ROLE OF SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN PUBLIC EDUCATION." DATA REQUIRED FOR THIS EXAMINATION WERE OBTAINED FROM A NATIONAL CROSS-SAMPLE OF ABOUT 190 ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS IN OVER 40 LARGE SCHOOL SYSTEMS. IT WAS EMPHASIZED THAT ALL FINDINGS OF THIS PROJECT HAVE REFERENCE TO GROUP OR CLASS, NOT INDIVIDUAL, DIFFERENCES BETWEEN MEN AND WOMEN PRINCIPALS. THESE SEX DIFFERENCES WERE EVALUATED, USING THE FOLLOWING FACTORS FOR COMPARISON--(1) CAREER DECISIONS AND OCCUPATIONAL HISTORIES, (2) SPECIFIC REACTIONS TO AND FEELINGS ABOUT WORK, AND (3) JOB PERFORMANCE AND OPERATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE RESPECTIVE SCHOOLS. MANY ASPECTS IN EACH OF THESE AREAS WERE FOUND TO HAVE DIRECT ASSOCIATIONS WITH SEX DIFFERENCES. ADDITIONAL RESEARCH WAS RECOMMENDED TO EXPAND THIS STUDY TO OTHER SCHOOL POPULATIONS, AS WELL AS SUCH AREAS AS BUSINESS AND THE PROFESSIONS. (JH)

ED 002949

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

MEN AND WOMEN AS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS

Neal Gross and Anne E. Trask

Graduate School of Education

Harvard University

Final Report No. 2

The research reported herein was performed under Contract No. 853 (SAE-8702) with the Cooperative Research Branch, United States Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

NATIONAL PRINCIPALSHIP STUDY

SENIOR RESEARCH STAFF

Director

Neal Gross

Research Associates

Peter C. Dodd

Paul E. Kelly

Robert Dreeben

Keith W. Prichard

Robert E. Herriott

Anne E. Trask

Joseph L. Hozid

Dean K. Whitla

Preface

This is the second of several monographs that present the findings of the National Principalship Study, a research program in the sociology of education sponsored by Harvard University and performed under Contract SAE-8702 with the Cooperative Research Branch, U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It constitutes the final report of the part of the Study that examined the backgrounds, careers, and performance of women and men as elementary school principals and the relationship of the sex of principals to the functioning of their schools. The first report of the Study focused on the effects and determinants of the professional leadership exhibited by principals as the executives of their schools. Additional final reports will present the findings that emerged from the study of role conflicts to which principals are exposed and the determinants and effects of selected dimensions of the principals' administrative performance.

It would not have been possible to undertake the inquiry reported in these pages without the cooperation and collaboration of many individuals. First, we wish to acknowledge our indebtedness to other members of the senior staff: Peter C. Dodd, Robert Dreeben, Robert E. Herriott, Joseph L. Hozid, Paul E. Kelly, Keith W. Prichard, and Dean K. Whitla. In addition to participating in the design of the overall Study, they prepared research materials, supervised field work activities in many cities, and conducted most of the interviews. The senior staff also served as editors and coders (or supervisors of coding) for both the questionnaire and interview data. Robert Dreeben assumed major responsibility for coding the open-ended interview materials and Peter C.

helpful services to the Study. These include: Stephen Call, William L. Hamilton, Walter O. Jewell, III, David Napier, Frank Newman, Roger D. Olney, Douglas Ridge, and Sanford Ungar. Stephen Call and Walter O. Jewell, III, deserve special recognition in this connection for the outstanding services they rendered in the program development and data processing phases of the Study.

Richard Labrie and Charles Cantor of the Harvard Statistical Laboratory were also of considerable assistance in developing computer programs to facilitate the data processing phase of the work. We are particularly indebted to Michael V. Solomita of the M.I.T. Computation Center and Robert Burns of the Harvard Computing Center for their assistance in making arrangements for data processing. Between January 1961 and September 1963 the statistical work presented in this report was done in part at the M.I.T. Computation Center. After September 1962, additional data processing was performed at the Harvard Computing Center and supported by a grant (GP 683) from the National Science Foundation to Harvard University.

Important clerical or computational tasks were performed by: Virginia Coates, Cynthia W. Cole, Edward Copeland, Roger Hussey, Jane Kelly, Annette B. Miller, and Antoinette Shelter.

There are several other people who deserve special comment because of their contributions to the Study. Donald J. Blyth, George W. Goethals, and Nathan Jacobson were extremely generous in sharing their wisdom with us about a number of problems examined in the research. Harold C. Hunt and Robert H. Anderson also stimulated our thinking about many issues in educational administration. The encouragement and

support of Francis Keppel, Dean of the Harvard Graduate School of Education when the Study was initiated and of individuals such as Calvin E. Gross, Finis E. Engleman, Forrest E. Connor, and Benjamin C. Willis are also gratefully acknowledged.

Marion L. Crowley served as the secretary of the Study, and we are indebted to her for her many valuable contributions in addition to typing the final manuscript. Elizabeth Maciaszek, Marcia Schwantes, and Charlene Worth ably carried out their many secretarial and related responsibilities. For her valuable editorial assistance, we are indebted to Mrs. Helen Hughes.

One hundred and eighty-nine principals and 1,303 teachers in 41 large American cities participated in the inquiry reported in these pages. Without the cooperation of these educators and the endorsement and support of the National Principalship Study by their school administrations and school boards, it would not have been possible to carry out the research program. We are greatly appreciative of their interest in the Study and the time and effort they devoted to it. We hope the research findings presented in this report of the Study will constitute some repayment for their cooperation.

We also wish to express our thanks to the Harvard Graduate School of Education and the Bureau of Educational Research, University of Illinois, for the encouragement and support they gave us in the preparation of this second final report of the National Principalship Study.

Despite all the help received, however, we alone, of course, are responsible for the shortcomings of this monograph.

Neal Gross

Anne E. Trask

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables

ix

Chapter 1: Background of the Study

The Study in Sociological Perspective	1 - 1
Sex and the Occupational Structure	1 - 2
Sex and Reactions to Work	1 - 3
Sex in Organizational Settings	1 - 7
Research Procedures	1 - 8
The Population and Sample	1 - 10
The Research Instruments	1 - 10
Collecting the Data	1 - 12
Processing the Data	1 - 12
The Use of Third Variables	1 - 16
	1 - 19

Chapter 2: Personal, Social, and Educational Backgrounds: Similarities and Differences

Personal Characteristics	2 - 1
Social Characteristics	2 - 1
Educational Backgrounds	2 - 6
	2 - 14

Chapter 3: Careers

The Decision to Become a Teacher	3 - 1
The Timing: Initial Consideration and Final Decision	3 - 2
Attraction to Teaching	3 - 2
Personal Influence: Encouragement and Discouragement	3 - 6
Summary Discussion	3 - 10
	3 - 15

The Decision to Become a Principal	3 - 22
The Timing	3 - 22
Attraction and Motivation	3 - 23
Personal Influence: Encouragement and Discouragement	3 - 28
Summary and Discussion	3 - 35
Career Histories	3 - 37
Administrative Experience	3 - 39
Years between First Position in Teaching and First Principalship	3 - 44
Age at First Becoming Principal	3 - 47
Experience in the Principalship	3 - 47
Summary and Discussion	3 - 50
 <u>Chapter 4: Occupational Aspirations</u>	 4 - 1
The Hypothesis	4 - 2
Testing the Hypothesis	4 - 6
Test of the Reasoning	4 - 11
Further Analyses	4 - 17
 <u>Chapter 5: Educational Values</u>	 5 - 1
Criteria for Evaluation of Schools	5 - 1
Differences between Individual Pupils	5 - 3
Academic Performance of Pupils	5 - 8
Delinquency-prone Pupils	5 - 12
Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child	5 - 17
Discipline of Pupils	5 - 19

Criteria for Evaluating Teachers	5 - 22
Technical Skills of Teachers	5 - 26
Organizational Responsibility	5 - 30
<u>Chapter 6: Reactions to Major Responsibilities</u>	6 - 1
Importance Assigned to Major Functions	6 - 1
Management of the Instructional Program	6 - 1
Administrative Tasks	6 - 7
Self-evaluation	6 - 8
Management of the Instructional Program	6 - 8
Administrative Tasks	6 - 11
Satisfactions	6 - 15
Supervision of the Instructional Program	6 - 15
Administrative Duties	6 - 18
<u>Chapter 7: Worry</u>	7 - 1
The Hypothesis	7 - 2
Testing the Hypothesis	7 - 3
Test of the Reasoning	7 - 8
Further Analyses	7 - 11
<u>Chapter 8: The Principal and his Professional Staff: Supervisory Control</u>	8 - 1
Control over Professional Activities	8 - 3
The Hypothesis	8 - 5
Testing the Hypothesis	8 - 7

Examination of the Rationale Underlying the Hypothesis	8 - 13
---	--------

Further Analyses	8 - 19
------------------	--------

Control over Organizational Policy- making	8 - 22
---	--------

Chapter 9: <u>The Principal and the Relations between Teacher and Pupil</u>	9 - 1
--	-------

Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils	9 - 1
---------------------------------------	-------

The Hypothesis	9 - 2
----------------	-------

Testing the Hypothesis	9 - 3
------------------------	-------

The Principal and Conflict between Teacher and Pupil	9 - 8
---	-------

The Hypothesis	9 - 8
----------------	-------

Testing the Hypothesis	9 - 10
------------------------	--------

Chapter 10: <u>Social Distance</u>	10 - 1
---	--------

Social Distance in the School	10 - 2
-------------------------------	--------

The Hypothesis	10 - 3
----------------	--------

Testing the Hypothesis	10 - 5
------------------------	--------

Further Analyses	10 - 8
------------------	--------

Social Distance Outside the School	10 - 12
------------------------------------	---------

The Hypothesis	10 - 12
----------------	---------

Testing the Hypothesis	10 - 15
------------------------	---------

Testing the Reasoning	10 - 18
-----------------------	---------

Further Analyses	10 - 22
------------------	---------

Chapter 11: <u>Parental Involvement in the School</u>	11 - 1
--	--------

The Hypothesis	11 - 4
----------------	--------

Testing the Hypothesis	11 - 7
Further Analyses	11 - 12
<u>Chapter 12: Organizational Performance</u>	12 - 1
The Performance of Teachers	12 - 2
Pupils' Performance	12 - 10
Teachers' Morale	12 - 20
<u>Chapter 13: Summary and Conclusions</u>	13 - 1
<u>Appendix A: Definifition of Subclassifications of Variables Used in "Third Variable Analyses"</u>	A - 1
<u>Appendix B: Specimen Research Instruments</u>	B - 1
Instrument Used to Measure the Worry Principals Express in Their Work	B - 2
Instrument Used to Measure the Weight Principals Apply to Different Criteria for Evaluating Teachers	B - 4
Instrument Used to Measure the Satisfaction Principals Derive from Various Aspects of Their Work	B - 8
Section of Teacher Questionnaire Used to Obtain Measures of the Role Performance of Principals	B - 11
<u>Appendix C: Guttman Scales and Factor Weights Used in the Measurement of Variables</u>	C - 1

PRECEDING PAGE BLANK-NOT FILMED

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
2 - 1:	Percentage Distribution of Age of Women and Men Principals	2 - 3
2 - 2:	Percentage Distribution of Marital Status of Women and Men Principals by Age	2 - 4
2 - 3:	Percentage Distribution of Parental Origins of Women and Men Principals by Age	2 - 5
2 - 4:	Percentage Distribution of the Occupations of the Fathers of Women and Men Principals by Age	2 - 8
2 - 5:	Percentage Distribution of the Occupations of the Employed Mothers of Women and Men Principals	2 - 9
2 - 6:	Percentage Distribution of the Education of the Fathers of Women and Men Principals	2 - 10
2 - 7:	Percentage Distribution of the Education of the Mothers of Women and Men Principals	2 - 12
2 - 8:	Percentage Distribution of the Income Position of the Parents of Women and Men Principals at Time of Principal's High School Graduation	2 - 13
2 - 9:	Percentage Distribution of Type of Community in Which Women and Men Principals Spent Most of their Youth by Age	2 - 15
2 - 10:	Percentage Distribution of Type of Elementary and Secondary School Attended by Women and Men Principals	2 - 17
2 - 11:	Percentage Distribution of Quality of Academic Work in Secondary School of Women and Men Principals	2 - 18
2 - 12:	Percentage Distribution of Type of Undergraduate College Attended by Women and Men Principals	2 - 19
2 - 13:	Percentage Distribution of Semester Hours of Undergraduate Education Courses Taken by Women and Men Principals	2 - 21

Table		Page
2 - 14:	Percentage Distribution of Quality of Academic Work in College of Women and Men Principals	2 - 23
2 - 15:	Percentage Distribution of Mode of Undergraduate Study of Women and Men Principals by Age	2 - 24
2 - 16:	Percentage Distribution of Highest Academic Degree Received by Women and Men Principals	2 - 26
2 - 17:	Percentage Distribution of Type of Graduate Institution Attended by Women and Men Principals	2 - 27
2 - 18:	Percentage Distribution of Semester Hours of Graduate Education Courses Taken by Women and Men Principals	2 - 30
2 - 19:	Percentage Distribution of Semester Hours of Administration Courses Taken by Women and Men Principals	2 - 31
2 - 20:	Percentage Distribution of Mode of Graduate Study of Women and Men Principals	2 - 33
3 - 1:	Time at Which Men and Women Principals Initially Considered Teaching as a Career	3 - 4
3 - 2:	Time at Which Men and Women Principals Made Final Decision to Become a Teacher	3 - 5
3 - 3:	Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported That Teaching Was Their First Choice as an Occupation	3 - 7
3 - 4:	Reasons Cited by Men Principals Who Initially Wanted to Enter Another Profession Before Becoming a Teacher	3 - 9
3 - 5:	Percentage of Men and Women Principals Who Mentioned Not Having Been Highly Motivated to Enter Teaching	3 - 11
3 - 6:	Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Responded That They Had Received Special Encouragement to Enter Teaching	3 - 12

Table	Page
3 - 7: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Encouragement of the Decision to Become a Teacher	3 - 14
3 - 8: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Being Discouraged from Entering Teaching	3 - 16
3 - 9: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Discouragement of the Decision to Become a Teacher	3 - 17
3 - 10: Time at Which Men Principals Initially Considered Teaching as a Career by High School Grades	3 - 19
3 - 11: Age at Which Women and Men Principals Reported They First Considered Becoming a Principal	3 - 24
3 - 12: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Mentioned Lack of Motivation or Accidental Factors in Discussing Reasons for Becoming a Principal	3 - 26
3 - 13: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Mentioned Mobility as a Reason for Wanting to Become a Principal	3 - 27
3 - 14: Percentage Distribution of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the Question: Why Did You Want to Become a Principal?	3 - 29
3 - 15: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Being Encouraged to Become a Principal	3 - 31
3 - 16: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Encouragement of the Decision to Become a Principal	3 - 33
3 - 17: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Being Discouraged from Becoming a Principal	3 - 34
3 - 18: Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Discouragement of the Decision to Become a Principal	3 - 36

Table

Page

3 - 19:	Percentage Distribution of the Career Patterns of Women and Men Principals up to But Not Including First Principalship	3 - 38
3 - 20:	Percentage Distribution of Total Years of Teaching Experience of Women and Men Principals	3 - 40
3 - 21:	Percentage Distribution of Years of Elementary School Teaching Experience of Women and Men Principals	3 - 41
3 - 22:	Percentage Distribution and Mean Years of Experience in In-school Administration below the Level of Principal of Women and Men Principals	3 - 43
3 - 23:	Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in System-wide Administration of Women and Men Principals	3 - 45
3 - 24:	Percentage Distribution of Years between First Educational Job and First Principalship of Women and Men Principals	3 - 46
3 - 25:	Percentage Distribution of Age on Becoming a Principal for the First Time of Women and Men Principals	3 - 48
3 - 26:	Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in All Types of Principalships Held Prior to Present Position by Women and Men Principals	3 - 49
3 - 27:	Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in Present Principalship of Women and Men Principals	3 - 51
3 - 28:	Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in All Principalships in All Systems through 1961 of Women and Men Principals	3 - 52
4 - 1:	Mean, Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Women and Men Principals on the Level of Aspiration Scale	4 - 8

Table		Page
4 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Level of Aspiration by Five Specified Subclassifications	4 - 10
4 - 3:	Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Level of Aspiration)	4 - 13
4 - 4:	Zero-order, First-order and Higher-order Partial Correlations of Sex and Level of Aspiration	4 - 16
4 - 5:	Percentage Distribution of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the 13 Items on Level of Aspiration	4 - 18
5 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern with Differences Between Individual Pupils	5 - 5
5 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern with Differences Between Individual Pupils by Six Specified Subclassifications	5 - 6
5 - 3:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Attributed to Academic Performance of Pupils	5 - 9
5 - 4:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Attributed to Academic Performance of Pupils by Two Specified Subclassifications	5 - 11
5 - 5:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Presence of Delinquency-prone Pupils in the School	5 - 14
5 - 6:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Presence of Delinquency-prone Pupils in the School by Six Specified Subclassifications	5 - 15
5 - 7:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child	

xx

Table

Page

5 - 8:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child by Seven Specified Subclassifications	5 - 20
5 - 9:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Discipline of Pupils	5 - 23
5 - 10:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Discipline of Pupils by Socio-economic Level of Student Body	5 - 24
5 - 11:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Attributed to the Technical Skills of Teachers	5 - 27
5 - 12:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Attributed to the Technical Skills of Teachers by Six Specified Subclassifications	5 - 28
5 - 13:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Attributed to the Organizational Responsibility of Teachers	5 - 32
5 - 14:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Attributed to the Organizational Responsibility of Teachers by Five Specified Subclassifications	5 - 33
6 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program	6 - 4
6 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program by Competence of Staff	6 - 6
6 - 3:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Assigned to Administrative Tasks	6 - 9
6 - 4:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Self-assessment of Ability to Direct Instruction	6 - 12

Table		Page
6 - 5:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Self-assessment of Ability to Direct Instruction by Eight Specified Subclassifications	6 - 13
6 - 6:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Self-assessment of Administrative Abilities	6 - 16
6 - 7:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction Derived from Managing the Instructional Program	6 - 19
6 - 8:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction Derived from Managing the Instructional Program by Eight Specified Subclassifications	6 - 20
6 - 9:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction Derived from Performing Administrative Tasks	6 - 23
6 - 10:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction Derived from Performing Administrative Tasks by Eight Specified Subclassifications	6 - 25
7 - 1:	Mean, Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Women and Men Principals on the Worry Scale	7 - 4
7 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Worry by Marital Status and Size of School	7 - 6
7 - 3:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Worry by Five Specified Subclassifications	7 - 7
7 - 4:	Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Worry)	7 - 10
7 - 5:	Zero-order, First-order and Higher-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Worry	7 - 12

Table		Page
7 - 6:	Percentage Distribution and Mean of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the Eleven Items on Worry	7 - 13
7 - 7:	Rank Ordering of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the Eleven Items on Worry	7 - 18
8 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities	8 - 10
8 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities by Five Specified Subclassifications	8 - 12
8 - 3:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities by Four Specified Subclassifications	8 - 14
8 - 4:	Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Control over Teachers' Professional Activities)	8 - 16
8 - 5:	Zero-order, First-order and Higher-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Control over Teachers' Professional Activities	8 - 17
8 - 6:	Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities	8 - 20
8 - 7:	Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Control over Organizational Policy-making	8 - 24
9 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils	9 - 5
9 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils by Two Specified Subclassifications	9 - 6
9 - 3:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils	9 - 12

Table		Page
9 - 4:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils by Two Specified Subclassifications	9 - 14
10 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance in the School	10 - 7
10 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance in the School by Mean Teacher Age	10 - 9
10 - 3:	Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance in the School	10 - 11
10 - 4:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance Outside the School	10 - 17
10 - 5:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance Outside the School by Five Specified Subclassifications	10 - 19
10 - 6:	Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Social Distance Outside the School)	10 - 21
10 - 7:	Zero-order and First-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Social Distance Outside the School	10 - 23
10 - 8:	Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance Outside the School	10 - 24
11 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Parental Involvement	11 - 9
11 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Parental Involvement by Socio-economic Level of Student Body	11 - 11
11 - 3:	Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Parental Involvement	11 - 13
12 - 1:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Professional Performance of Their Teachers	12 - 5

Table		Page
12 - 2:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Professional Performance of Their Teachers by Two Specified Subclassifications	12 - 6
12 - 3:	Mean Scores of Women and Principals on Professional Performance of Their Teachers by Five Specified Subclassifications	12 - 8
12 - 4:	Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Professional Performance of Teachers)	12 - 9
12 - 5:	Zero-order and First-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Professional Performance of Teachers	12 - 11
12 - 6:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Pupils' Performance	12 - 14
12 - 7:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Pupils' Performance by Socio-economic Level of Student Body	12 - 16
12 - 8:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Pupils' Performance by Eight Specified Subclassifications	12 - 17
12 - 9:	Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variable and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Pupils' Performance)	12 - 19
12 - 10:	Zero-order and First-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Pupils' Performance	12 - 21
12 - 11:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Teachers' Morale	12 - 24
12 - 12:	Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Teachers' Morale by Eight Specified Subclassifications	12 - 25
C - 1:	Technical Details of Scale Construction: Level of Aspiration	C - 3

Table		Page
C - 2:	Technical Details of Scale Construction: Worry	C - 4
C - 3:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Concern with Differences Between Individual Pupils	C - 5
C - 4:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Attribute to the Academic Performance of Pupils	C - 6
C - 5:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Emphasis on the Presence of Delinquency-prone Pupils in the School	C - 7
C - 6:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child	C - 8
C - 7:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Emphasis on the Discipline of Pupils	C - 9
C - 8:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Attribute to the Technical Skills of Teachers	C - 10
C - 9:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Attribute to the Organizational Responsibility of Teachers	C - 11
C - 10:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 186 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Assign to Managing the Instructional Program	C - 12

Table		Page
C - 11:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 186 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Assign to Administrative Tasks	C - 13
C - 12:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Self-assessment of Their Ability to Direct Instruction	C - 14
C - 13:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Self-assessment of Their Administrative Abilities	C - 15
C - 14:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Satisfaction They Derive from Managing the Instructional Program	C - 16
C - 15:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Satisfaction They Derive from Performing Administrative Tasks	C - 17
C - 16:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Control over Teachers' Professional Activities	C - 18
C - 17:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils	C - 19
C - 18:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils	C - 20

Table

Page

C - 19:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Social Distance in the School	C - 21
C - 20:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Social Distance Outside the School	C - 22
C - 21:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Parental Involvement	C - 23
C - 22:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of the Professional Performance of Teachers	C - 24
C - 23:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Pupils' Performance	C - 25
C - 24:	Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Teachers' Morale	C - 26

Chapter 1: Background of the Study

All but a few of the executive positions in American occupational life are filled primarily by men. One of the exceptions is the elementary principalship in public schools of which at present nearly four out of every 10 are filled by women. This relatively balanced sex ratio in an institution, old and universal in the nation, makes the elementary school a good place to examine some largely unexplored issues of sociological and educational importance.

We have little knowledge of how men and women working in identical managerial capacities differ from each other. Thus, for example, whether the sex of an executive is related to managerial performance or the productivity or morale of the enterprise he (or she) manages remains a largely unanswered question. When women and men achieve the same executive positions, are they equally gratifying to both? Do the sexes differ in their ambitions for further advancement? And do men and women vary in the timing, context, and motivation of choice and decision in their careers?

This monograph reports the findings of the National Principalship Study on these and other questions about men and women as elementary school principals. The data were obtained through personal interviews and other techniques from a random sample of 189 elementary principals in all regions of the United States, supplemented by questionnaires answered by teachers in their schools.

In addition to contributing to our very limited sociological knowledge about the effects upon the person and his or her career and upon the organization itself of the sex of an executive, our findings may be

of practical value to public school officials puzzled over the ultimate consequences of the steadily declining proportion of female elementary school administrators appointed in the past 30 years--for between 1928 and 1958 the proportion of women elementary school principals decreased from 55 to 38 per cent.¹ Whether, as a result of the sex of the chief administrator, the schools are pervaded by different "climates" or qualities of leadership or variations in the morale and the performance of teachers and the learning of pupils must be established before policies to encourage the trend or reverse it may be intelligently formulated.

The basic orientation of this study of the effects on the school of the sex of the principal is sociological. The differing expectations and experiences that men and women encounter in their social relationships in and out of the world of work led us to anticipate sex differences in the principals' careers, in their reaction and orientation to their job, and in how they operate their schools. We might have begun from other points of view, for example, the psychological,² but the reasoning underlying the predictions and hypotheses we shall examine essentially reflect past and present social influences presumably brought to bear upon the men and women who serve as school executives.

The Study in Sociological Perspective

Our study cuts across three separate, but related, fields of sociology: the sociology of education, the analysis of work and occupations, and the study of formal organizations. In reviewing the literature in each, while we found that little systematic attention has been

directed to the attitudinal, career, and organizational correlates of the sex of executives, we did find provocative several theoretically-oriented discussions and certain studies on the influence of sex. A brief review of some of the ideas which we drew upon from this body of literature will place our study in its sociological setting: we shall consider them under the following headings: (1) sex and the occupational structure, (2) sex and reactions to work, and (3) sex in organizational settings.

Sex and the Occupational Structure

In every society, from primitive to modern, sex is important in the selection and allocation of occupations. There is "men's work" and "women's work." American society, of course, contains occupations such as private domestic service and secretarial work in which women predominate and others such as craftsmen and farmers which are largely in male hands. Similarly with professions; in social work and nursing there are relatively few men but in medicine and law, relatively few women.

How commonly the sex-typing of occupations is accepted is shown in Rosenberg's study of the occupational aspirations of college students.³ In his sample of students, half of the men but only five per cent of the women expressed the ambition to enter vocations such as law, engineering, farming, or business. On the other hand, over three times the proportion of women selected teaching, social work, secretarial work, or art as of men.⁴ This suggests that in our society sex-typing may also extend to the organizations in which men and women work. Women

much more frequently than men anticipate employment by humanitarian, educational, or non-profit organizations while nearly four times as many men as women expect to be independent entrepreneurs or professionals, that is, to have their own business, farm, or professional practice.⁵

In times of shortage of skilled and professional workers, the sexes may infiltrate each other's world of work.⁶ Then, especially, can women invade spheres traditionally monopolized by men. Generally, the intrusion is temporary or the occupations end by being reallocated to the sex formerly excluded. In any event, the sex-typing of occupations persists and shows every sign of continuing to do so.

Parsons has pointed out the significance, as he put it, of "the asymmetrical relationship of the sexes to the occupational structure."⁷ An approved occupational role is fundamental to the status of an adult male. His economic and social standing and that of his family, if he is married, is determined by the prestige accruing to his position in the occupational structure. Not so of women, at least in American society; their role is anchored in the family and marriage sets their status. Single adult working women, a minority of their sex, are typically described in terms of their marital status, that is, as "not married": rarely are they ranked by the status of their occupations.

Furthermore, circumstances confronting men and women in their careers at work are quite different, as Caplow noted.⁸ For one thing, the occupational careers of women are usually not continuous. While men are expected to work from the termination of their formal education

until retirement or death, most women are expected to work only in the interval between school and marriage or the birth of the first child. (Increasingly, however, they are expected to return to the labor force when the last child has entered school.) In the second place, in contrast to most men, the great majority of women are secondary breadwinners: their earnings, if not used for their own support, generally supplement the income of parents, husband, or other members of the family. Again women tend to move about less freely than men. Married women, for example, generally seek employment in the communities in which their husbands work. Fourthly, at any given time a much larger proportion of qualified women than of men are out of the labor force. Thus many women who are qualified to teach are not in the schools; in the nursing profession a relatively small proportion of the trained personnel are exercising their professional skills.

Adult working women, single or married, when in positions or professions usually ascribed to men, pose a "status contradiction" to those who work with them. As Hughes points out, "people carry in their minds a set of expectations concerning the auxiliary traits properly associated with many of the specific positions available in our society. These expectations appear as advantages or disadvantages to persons who, in keeping with American social belief and practice, aspire to positions new to persons of their kind."⁹ Women, because of the structure and content of sex roles in our society and differences in the kind and amount of their participation in the world of work, when in positions of authority present a contradiction in status. These top

positions are generally allocated to men, and consequently, women confront obstacles in striving for advancement to them. Caplow argues that norms about male-female relationships at work are their greatest handicap:

Women are barred from four out of every five occupational functions, not because of incapacity or technological unsuitability, but because the attitudes which govern interpersonal relationships in our culture sanction only a few working relationships between men and women, and prohibit all the others on grounds that have nothing to do with technology.¹⁰

Two other norms, he says, are especially significant. The first is that a man must never be directly subordinate to a woman in an occupational relationship; the second is that intimate groups, except those based on family or sexual ties, should be composed of either sex, but never of both.¹¹ For these reasons, men accept women superiors with great reluctance and the majority of women in supervisory positions are likely to have women subordinates only or to be in technical or staff jobs involving little exercise of authority. Whyte's finding that the male countermen in restaurants resist taking orders from female waitresses is a case in point.¹² And Caplow maintains that male workers in their customary opposition to the introduction of a woman in their midst are suffering from feelings of guilt since society has taught them--and the women as well--to avoid occupational competition with each other.¹³

Sex and Reactions to Work

Occupational roles have their subjective as well as their objective dimensions. Although sociologists and social psychologists have examined attitudes toward work, specific occupations and professions, morale and satisfaction in work, in only a few studies has systematic attention been given to the differences attributable to sex among individuals employed in the same occupation. This may in part be explained by the difficulty of obtaining large enough samples of men and women in situations comparable as to role and work.

Rosenberg's findings about the occupational values of college students¹⁴ and Mason's study of school teachers who are beginners¹⁵ support the proposition that occupational considerations play a more important part in the life plans of men than of women and that men expect to find greater gratification in the occupational world than do women.

Rosenberg established the fact that

. . .three times as many men expected their careers to represent their "major life satisfaction" as did women. In American society, men expect to spend the major part of their lives at work; the woman's long-rang view tends to focus on family relationships. Whereas virtually none (less than one-half of one percent) of the men did not expect to be working ten years after graduation, this expectation was expressed by 52 percent of the women.¹⁶

Rosenberg's and Mason's studies suggest that on the whole women and men differ as to what values they hope will be satisfied in the

world of work. While male college students, as well as male beginners at teaching, emphasize extrinsic rewards, such as money and security, more than do their female counterparts, the women stress the satisfactions in the nature of the work itself, for example, being of service and working with others, more than do the men. Rosenberg's findings also reveal that career-oriented women as a rule share the occupational values of career-oriented men and that these somewhat atypical women give less importance to the values cherished by the majority of female college students: "The career woman tends to want to satisfy the values which men choose in work rather than the values selected by other women."¹⁷

Mason's and other studies¹⁸ also show that when women and men are employed in the same occupation, the women as a rule find greater satisfaction in the job than do the men.

Sex in Organizational Settings

The effect of sex on the functioning of organizations is neglected in sociological research; we could, for example, find no studies of the influence of the sex of executives on such matters as the staff's morale or its productivity.¹⁹ In one of the very few pertinent inquiries, Cussler²⁰ reports a descriptive study based on interviews with 55 women executives, most of whom were at the level of middle management in a variety of organizations in two Eastern cities. She concludes that women may often achieve executive status through the intervention of sponsors or superiors and, once they have it, they are likely to become more involved in their work than men.

The remarks of Gardner on the conventional prejudice against placing women in managerial or supervisory positions in large organizations are typical of the presentation of this situation in the literature on organizational analysis.

. . .there is the general belief that women make poor supervisors, that they are too emotional and "take things personally," that they cannot command the loyalty and respect of their subordinates nor the co-operation of their equals. In the face of such beliefs, which appear among executives as well as workers, women are rarely given a chance at supervisory positions. And when occasionally one is given such an opportunity, her superiors are always doubtful, as if to say, "We know women don't usually make good supervisors, so we really don't expect you to succeed."²¹

Our review of the pertinent sociological literature led us to a conclusion similar to that which Gouldner reached:

. . .many sociologists who study factories, offices, schools, or mental hospitals take little note of the fact that the organizational role-players invariably have a gender around which is built a latent social identity. One does not have to be Freudian to insist that sex makes a difference, even for organizational behavior. (It should be noted that there is no analytic distinction between giving attention to the ways in which latent ethnic or religious identities affect organizational behavior and examining the implications of latent sexual identities for organizational patterns.)²²

Before presenting our empirical findings about organizational and personal circumstances and conditions associated with the sex of principals, we will describe the methods we used to obtain our data.

Research Procedures

Our inquiry was conducted as part of a larger investigation, the National Principalship Study, whose purpose was to inquire into a number of social science and educational questions.²³ In one large field operation, involving a stratified random cluster sample of school principals in large American cities and their higher administrators and teachers, we obtained data to meet the requirements of the several studies at one and the same time, a circumstance which we mention here because many technical issues relevant to the present research were handled in a manner most effective for the multiple objectives of the National Principalship Study.

The Population and Sample

We defined the target population of principals for the National Principalship Study as all supervising principals in cities of 50,000 or more during the school year 1960-1961. The nearly 11,000 principals in cities of this size listed in the latest available Biennial Census (the 1955-1956 Census) of the U. S. Office of Education at the time of the Study were first stratified by: geographical region, per-pupil expenditure of the system, and size of city. Through a cluster sampling procedure designed to secure five per cent of the population, the sample

was established as 508 principals in 41 cities.

To select the actual sample, the schools in each of the 41 cities were categorized according to grade level (elementary, junior high, or senior high) and also by the averaged socio-economic status of their pupils (high, middle, and low) as estimated by the superintendent of schools.²⁴ These procedures insured a sample of schools representing a range of school grades and of socio-economic status of the pupils.

The men and women school administrators who are the subjects of our inquiry into how the sex of principals enters into the management of schools are, of course, only those who are in the sample of elementary school principals involved in the larger study. We picked our respondents from the principals in elementary schools primarily because so few women hold principalships in secondary schools. If we had included junior and senior high principals, the scarcity of females among them would have made it impossible to carry out many of the analyses planned as an integral part of the research.

The National Principalship Study provided a sample of 189 elementary schools in 41 cities. For 14 schools we have no data from the teachers because the higher administration would not consent to their participation. Therefore, in the analyses of principals which involve data from teachers--for example, their observations about the performance of their principals--the maximum number of cases is 175. When analyses required only data obtained from principals--for example, reports on their level of aspiration--the maximum number of cases is 189.

The Research Instruments

During the preliminary planning of the Study considerable time and effort were devoted to devising the instruments and schedules for measuring the many variables on which the several investigations were to focus, for example, role conflict, role performance, and level of aspiration. Graduate students in a seminar at Harvard University pre-tested some of the instruments in interviews with 75 principals of schools in Greater Boston.

When drafts of all the questionnaires and interview schedules were ready, a final pre-test was made with eight principals from Greater Boston and New York who were invited to our offices in Cambridge for a day. Each was interviewed by a staff member for approximately eight hours. Following their completing of the instruments, the procedures and any problems connected with them or the instruments were discussed. The pre-test was valuable in many respects, especially in revealing that it would call for an additional four hours to collect the data we needed; and this led us to resort to three separate procedures, each requiring approximately four hours: (1) a Personal and Background Questionnaire completed by the principal in his community; (2) a Role Questionnaire filled out at a session with other principals in his city; (3) a personal interview.

Collecting the Data

For delving into the several problems included in it, the National Principalship Study called for the collection of data from school principals, their administrative superiors, and their teachers. Three

steps were involved in collecting data from the principals. The first was the sending of a personal letter to each principal in the sample, telling him he had been selected, explaining the objectives of the Study, and asking him to complete a structured questionnaire inquiring into his personal characteristics and his background, the history of his career, and the characteristics of his school. The covering letter made plain the anonymous and confidential nature of the Study. Each principal was requested to bring the completed Personal and School Background Questionnaire to a luncheon meeting to be held later that month for all the principals in his city who were to take part in the Study.

During the fall of 1960 members of the Study staff visited each of the 41 cities in the sample for approximately five days. Generally, they arrived in the community on Sunday evening and established headquarters in a centrally-located hotel. On Monday morning the field-work director got in touch with the superintendent of schools or his representative, reviewed the plans for the week and answered questions. On Monday afternoon a luncheon was held for the principals, to which the superintendent of schools and his chief administrative aides were invited. Then the Study staff reviewed the purposes of the research, discussed the planned field work and again stressed the anonymous nature of the Study. After the higher administrative officials had been excused, the second collection of data took place: the principals were requested to respond to a Role Questionnaire which consisted of 10 sections and covered such matters as their attitudes and values, their

conception of their role, the satisfaction and dissatisfaction they found in their work, their aspirations and their commitment to their careers. The Questionnaire required approximately four hours. Members of the Study staff remained in the room while the principals completed it and answered any questions concerning it.

During the latter part of the week of the luncheon meeting, a three- to five-hour personal interview was held with each of the principals, usually in a private room at the local headquarters of the Study staff. After the staff had answered their questions, if any, and reviewed the Background and Role Questionnaires, they then asked the principals about things that we believed could be most effectively dealt with by interview: questions pertaining to their strengths and weaknesses, their motives in becoming principals, the obstacles and conflicts in role encountered in their work, and their assessment of their staffs and higher administrations. Only seven of the 308 principals in the total sample failed to take part in all three phases of the collection of data.

Several of our inquiries called for data from the immediate administrative superiors of the principals in the sample. To accomplish this, we then called a second luncheon meeting on a Friday for the superintendent of schools and the immediate administrative superiors of the principals, similar to the one held earlier in the week for principals. Again, the design and objectives of the Study were reviewed, the week's activities described, and questions answered. The higher administrators were asked to answer a lengthy Superior's Questionnaire,

similar in many respects to the instruments filled out by the principals, except that this time it was to be from the perspective of the central administration. One hundred and seventy-two higher administrators responded, of whom 128 were later classified as the immediate superiors of the 501 principals in the total sample.

The inquiry into the influence of the principal's sex and other inquiries of the larger Study used teachers as a source of data. In the spring of 1961 a random sample of 10 teachers in each of the elementary, junior high, and senior high schools whose principals were included in the Study²⁵ was asked to answer questions in a 21-page Teacher Questionnaire on their principal's role and their own, their principal's performance, satisfactions in their jobs and careers, and their personal and occupational histories. They were also asked to serve as observers of their fellow teachers, the pupils, and the parents of their pupils.

To obtain the highest possible rate of return, after two and then after four weeks follow-up letters were sent to teachers who still had not sent in the questionnaires. Out of 4,760 teachers 3,367 (71 per cent) returned usable questionnaires. Of special relevance to the study of the effect of the principal's sex is the fact that 1,303 of the 1,750 elementary school teachers, or 74 per cent, returned the Teacher Questionnaire in usable form. (Some of the instruments used in securing data from the principals and their teachers are reproduced in Appendix B.)

Processing the Data

Most of the data were pre-coded: the Background Questionnaire, the Role Questionnaire, the Superior's Questionnaire, and the Teacher Questionnaire. After being edited by staff members to clarify questionable replies, the responses were punched directly on IBM cards by professional operators and then verified.

The open-ended data from the personal interview were handled differently. We followed standard methods of content analysis²⁶ in devising codes to categorize responses which then were coded by two independent coders. After each coder had coded the replies of some 50 principals, his work was checked against the second coder's and if they were in substantial agreement no further checks were made until all coding was completed; if not, the coders discussed their differences and clarified their definitions of the categories, after which a new sample of replies was checked for reliability. A final verification was carried out on a random sample of the completed questionnaires. Following this, the coded data were punched on IBM cards and verified in the same way as the pre-coded questionnaire materials. Nearly all data were processed electronically with high-speed computers and related equipment, which facilitated greatly the development of summary measures or indices of key concepts.

The chief statistical techniques to reduce the data from a series of responses to a single score were the Guttman scale and factor analysis. At first we tried to devise Guttman scales as indices of most of our key concepts. When the data did not meet the requirements of

Guttman scaling, a principal components factor analysis was undertaken.²⁷ If the factors that emerged could be interpreted clearly, their loadings were used as weights in computing factor scores; if not, the significant factors were rotated following Kaiser's Varimax criterion,²⁸ which maximizes or minimizes factor loadings within the restriction of orthogonality. The factor loadings resulting from the Varimax solution were converted to factor score coefficients using Harman's "shortened method," and the new coefficients were used as weights in computing factor scores used in the analysis.²⁹

On a number of the instruments, principals and teachers were asked to respond to the same questions. Since the major focus of the National Principalship Study was, of course, upon principals, all factor analyses were carried out on the correlation matrices computed from their responses. When factor scores were also required for the teachers, the item means, standard deviations, and factor weights resulting from the principals' matrix were applied to the teachers' data in computing their factor scores. Since at the outset of the Study we were interested in comparing the orientations and actions of school principals, in developing summary scores of their behavior we applied the item means, standard deviations, and factor weights resulting from the factor analysis of their orientations to all responses (their own and those of their teachers) about their actions, thereby making certain that the operational definition of all scores developed from a given set of items would be identical. (See Appendix C for the item means, standard deviations, and factor weights used in arriving at the summary measures of the

principals' behavior based on the reports of teachers.)

In order to establish a "best estimate" of the behavior of the principals the reports of the from four to 10 teacher-observers in each school as to the behavior of their principal were averaged for each of the several dimensions examined in the National Principalship Study. However, before doing this for the 175 elementary schools which were the central focus of this and another investigation of the Study, studies of the reliability of the reports of the 1,303 elementary teachers who served as observers of the principals were undertaken. In the first report of the National Principalship Study, which has been reported by Gross and Harriott,³⁰ it was concluded that the reports of the elementary teachers as to the Executive Professional Leadership of both men and women principals were found to be both reliable and relatively free from any bias associated with the personal characteristics of the teachers.

One other methodological point: some of the inquiries of the National Principalship Study concerned 501 elementary, junior, and senior high schools while others, like this, pertained only to elementary schools. Thus in this study we faced the alternative of using scores operationally derived from an analysis of data secured in all 501 schools, or of repeating the lengthy and expensive task of Guttman scaling and factor analysis of the elementary schools alone. We decided on the first course because of the empirical findings that resulted from an examination by Gross and Harriott³¹ of the difference between factor scores defined from factor analyses of the data based on the entire 501

schools and from the 175 elementary schools. They found that when Pearsonian product-moment correlation coefficients were computed from scores developed from the 501 and 175 cases on teachers' morale, teachers' professional performance, and pupil academic performance, all were in excess of .999. Thus, their findings revealed that there would be no appreciable advantage in duplicating the factor analysis and scaling procedures to obtain a new set of measures specifically for the elementary schools.

The Use of Third Variables

In many of our analyses we shall introduce a third variable in conventional ways; for example, to determine if we are making a spurious interpretation of a relationship. Moreover, we shall introduce "third variables" to determine if findings from the total sample are internally replicated in sub-classifications of the sample; we shall use them, too, to explore conditional relationships.

A fourth use of third variables, however, deserves special comment. We shall specify the reasoning on which hypotheses to be tested are based. In each instance we posit that one or more third variables may intervene as links in a causal chain between the sex of principals and a specified dependent variable, accounting in part for the relationship between the two. If the reasoning underlying the hypothesis has any justification in fact, then two necessary conditions should exist: first, the variable(s) posited as intervening between the independent and dependent ones should be related to both of them; second, if this specification is met, then when the effects of the intervening variable(s)

are removed (through partial correlation, for example) the strength of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables should diminish.³² The logic here is that if the relationship between the independent and dependent variables remains the same, then the explanatory variable being held constant in this manner could have no bearing at all on the relationship, since it has no effect on it. However, when our analyses indicate empirical support for third variables serving as links between an independent and dependent variable as specified by our reasoning, such findings indicate only the possibility that the third variables could enter in in a causal manner. Conclusive evidence in support of the existence of such relationships can only be obtained from research designs in which the time order of the several variables (independent, intervening, and dependent) can be controlled.

Notes and References for Chapter One

1. "The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study," Thirty-seventh Yearbook, The National Elementary Principal, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association (1958), p. 110.
2. Such an orientation would probably place great stress on the psychological ideas of Freud and Deutsch. See Sigmund Freud, New Introductory Lectures on Psycho-analysis (New York: W. W. Norton and Company, Inc., 1933); and Helene Deutsch, Psychology of Women (New York: Grune and Stratton, 1944), Volumes I and II. Also see Therese Benedek, "The Sexual Cycle in Women," Psychosomatic Medicine Monographs, Volume 3 (Washington: National Research Council, 1942); and Marie Jahoda and Joan Havel, "Psychological Problems of Women in Different Social Roles," Educational Record, XXXVI (1955), pp. 325-335.
3. Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957).
4. Ibid., p. 50.
5. Ibid.
6. Edward Gross, Work and Society (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1958), p. 158.
7. Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," in Essays in Sociological Theory (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 89-103; also Talcott Parsons, et al., Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), Chapter I.

8. Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), pp. 234-237.
9. Everett C. Hughes, Man and Their Work (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 106.
10. Caplow, op. cit., p. 237.
11. Ibid., p. 238.
12. William F. Whyte, Human Relations in the Restaurant Industry (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1948).
13. Caplow, op. cit., p. 239.
14. Rosenberg, op. cit., pp. 48-49.
15. Ward S. Mason, The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961).
16. Rosenberg, op. cit., p. 49.
17. Ibid., p. 50.
18. Mason, op. cit.; for a review of other studies, see Lawrence G. Thomas, The Occupational Structure and Education (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1956), pp. 198-200.
19. A study of elementary school administrators by Hemphill, et al., came to our attention after we had designed our research. They report sex differences although incidental to the main objectives of their study, and we will consider their findings when relevant to our own. (John K. Hemphill, et al., Administrative Performance and Personality [New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962].)
20. Margaret Cussler, The Woman Executive (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, 1958).

21. Burleigh B. Gardner, Human Relations in Industry (Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1945), p. 269.
22. Alvin W. Gouldner, "Organizational Analysis," in Robert K. Merton, Leonard Broom, and Leonard S. Cottrell, Jr., (Eds.) Sociology Today (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1959), p. 412.
23. The findings of the inquiry concerned with the effects and determinants of the professional leadership exhibited by principals were reported in Neal Gross and Robert E. Harriott, The Professional Leadership of Elementary School Principals, Final Report No. 1, Cooperative Research Project No. 853, April 1964. Other final reports will present the findings of studies on the role conflict of principals and the determinants and effects of selected dimensions of the principals' administrative performance.
24. The breakdown of the 301 schools by school level included in the total study was: elementary - 189; junior high - 150; and senior high - 162. Principals supervising more than one building as well as first-year principals were excluded from the sample.
25. Forty of the 41 school systems participated in this phase of the Study.
26. See William J. Goode and Paul K. Hatt, Methods in Social Research (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1952), Chapter XIX and Marie Jahoda, Morton Deutsch and Stuart W. Cook, Research Methods in Social Relations (New York: The Dryden Press, 1951), Chapter XVI.
27. For an excellent treatment of factor analysis, see Harry H. Harman, Modern Factor Analysis (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1960).

28. Henry F. Kaiser, "The Varimax Criterion for Analytic Rotation in Factor Analysis," Psychometrika, XXIII (1958), pp. 187-200; and Henry F. Kaiser, "Computer Program for Varimax Rotation in Factor Analysis," Educational and Psychological Measurement, XIX (1960), pp. 413-430.
29. See Henry F. Kaiser, "Formulas for Component Scores," Psychometrika, XXVII (1962), pp. 33-37.
30. Gross and Harriott, op. cit., Chapter Two.
31. Ibid., Appendix B.
32. For an introduction to the logic and problems of introducing third variables into the analysis of the relationship between two variables, see Patricia L. Kendall and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Problems of Survey Analysis," in Robert K. Merton and Paul F. Lazarsfeld (Eds.), Continuities in Social Research (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950), pp. 148-167.

Chapter 2: Personal, Social, and Educational Backgrounds: Similarities and Differences

Occupational roles both influence and are influenced by the characteristics of those recruited to them.¹ The backgrounds of recruits in the occupations and professions have long been of interest to sociologists, bearing as they do not only on the study of work, but on questions of social mobility and the relationship between the family, the educational and the occupational systems. For this and for two other reasons we were interested in examining similarities and differences in the backgrounds of men and women principals. One is that many hypotheses we propose to test are based on assumptions about differences in the principals' personal, social, and educational characteristics; and we wanted to find out whether there was empirical support for them. The second is that we wanted to learn what elements in the principals' backgrounds needed to be held constant in examining their attitudes and dimensions of their performance that might be correlated to their sex. If, for example, it turned out that among the principals the women worry less than men, the relationship might simply be a function of a difference in age between the men and the women, if the women were the older.²

To what extent and in what ways, then, are the personal, social, and educational backgrounds of men and women principals similar and in what ways different?

Personal Characteristics

There are 189 principals in our sample: 91 women and 98 men. On the average, the women are older than the men: the mean age of the women is 54.3 years and of the men 49.2 (their median ages are 54.1 and

48.5 years, respectively).³ Other aspects of the age distribution point this difference up even more sharply (Table 2-1). Approximately four-fifths (79 per cent) of the women in our sample are 30 years of age or older in contrast to less than one-half (47 per cent) of the men, and over three times as many men as women (19 per cent vs. 6 per cent) are in the two youngest age categories (under 39 years of age).

The difference in marital status between men and women principals is even more striking: the men are predominantly married while the women are predominantly single. Over nine out of 10 of the men in the sample are married, but almost two-thirds of the women are single, a difference that exists in all age groups (Table 2-2). In view of differences in the expectations generally held for single and married men and single and married women relative to family and work, this variable, too, may be highly relevant in considering principals' behavior in their occupational roles.⁴

There is only a slight difference in the racial characteristics of our sample: 96 per cent of the women in comparison with 92 per cent of the men are white; with one exception, the remainder are Negro.

We discovered that for the entire sample 76 per cent of the men and 70 per cent of the women came from families in which both parents were native born (Table 2-3). When we take into account the age of the principals, however, an interesting additional finding emerges. While a larger proportion of the "young" than the "old" women principals had parents who were native born, the reverse is true for the men: 91 per cent of the youngest, in comparison with 63 per cent of the oldest women

Table 2-1. Percentage Distribution of Age of Women and Men Principals

Age	Women (N=91)	Men (N=98)
60-69 years	20%	15%
50-59 years	59	32
40-49 years	15	54
30-39 years	6	13
20-29 years	-	1
	100%	100%
Mean	54.3	49.2
Median	54.1	48.5

[illegible]

Table 2-3. Percentage Distribution of Parental Origins of Women and Men Principals by Age

Parental Origins	Age						All Cases	
	Young (25-45)		Middle (46-55)		Old (56-70)		Women (N=11)	Men (N=93)
	Women (N=11)	Men (N=37)	Women (N=37)	Men (N=32)	Women (N=43)	Men (N=29)	Women (N=91)	Men (N=93)
One or both parents foreign-born	9%	30%	30%	20%	37%	14%	30%	24%
Native-born parents	91	70	70	72	63	86	70	76
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

principals came from families in which both parents were born in the United States; among the men, however, only 70 per cent of the youngest, as compared with 86 per cent of the eldest, had parents born in this country. Male principals, then, are being recruited nowadays less from the native-born of native parents and more from the native-born of foreign parentage.

In summary, the most striking differences in the personal characteristics of men and women principals in our sample concern their age and marital status. Female principals tend to be older than male and are predominantly single, while almost all the males are married.

Social Characteristics

Do men and women principals differ from each other in social origins as indexed by their fathers' occupation? Our findings reveal that they do: a greater proportion of women (51 per cent) than men principals (36 per cent) come from white-collar families.⁵ In addition, 30 per cent of the women, as compared with 38 per cent of the men, had fathers who were blue-collar workers; and 17 per cent of the women in contrast to 22 per cent of the men said their fathers were farmers. These findings about the differing occupational origins of men and women principals are generally consistent with those of other recent studies based on samples of teachers.⁶

If we make the assumption, similar to one made by Mason in his study of beginning teachers,⁷ that children of clerks, salesmen, blue-collar workers, and farmers improve their status by becoming principals, then 71 per cent of the men, in contrast to 59 per cent of the women,

have been upwardly mobile. If we accept a more limited criterion of upward mobility, applying it only to those families in which the father had a semi-skilled or unskilled job, then 30 per cent of the women and 38 per cent of the men turn out to be upwardly mobile.

By looking at father's occupation among the men and the women principals classified in age groups, we can assess whether or not this sex difference in social origins is recent or long standing. The data indicate that women principals have tended to come from families of higher status than have the men, for at least a generation. Within each age category, a greater proportion of women than men are of white-collar origin. In the age group 46 - 55, the difference between men and women is not so pronounced but the direction of the trend is the same (Table 2-4).

Since teaching is typically thought of as a woman's profession, mother's occupation is relevant to our interests. Is there a greater tendency for the women than the men principals to come from families where the mother was or is a teacher? The answer is yes: of the principals who had mothers who are or were in the labor force, twice as many of the women had mothers who were teachers as the men (46 per cent vs. 24 per cent). (Table 2-5)

Since occupation and education are highly correlated, from what we already know of the fathers' occupations, we would expect the fathers of women principals to have had more education than the fathers of the men. Table 2-6 bears out this expectation: 29 per cent of the women, but 51 per cent of the men, reported that their fathers had had only an

Father's Occupation	Age				All Cases	
	Young (25-45)		Middle (46-55)		Old (56-70)	
	Women (N=11)	Men (N=36)	Women (N=37)	Men (N=32)	Women (N=91)	Men (N=93)
Professional or scientific	18%	6%	22%	16%	22%	10%
Managerial or executive	18	14	16	16	17	15
Clerical or sales	9	14	19	18	12	11
<u>White Collar</u>	45	44	57	50	51	56
Skilled craftsman or foreman, semi-skilled, protective	28	42	22	22	26	32
Unskilled worker	9	8	5	-	4	6
<u>Blue Collar</u>	57	50	27	22	50	58
<u>Farmer</u>	18	11	11	25	17	22
<u>Other</u>	-	2	2	2	2	4
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2-5. Percentage Distribution of the Occupations of the Employed Mothers of Women and Men Principals

Mother's Occupation	Women (N=33)	Men (N=38)
Teaching	46%	24%
Nursing	-	-
Secretarial	12	13
Sales	6	5
Industrial	6	-
Domestic	30	55
Other	-	3
	100%	100%

Table 2-6. Percentage Distribution of the Education of the Fathers of Women and Men Principals

Father's Education	Women (N=91)	Men (N=97)
No formal education	2%	2%
Completed elementary school or some elementary school	27	49
Graduated from high school or some high school	44	32
Some college	9	12
Graduated from college	10	-
Graduate or professional school	9	5
	100%	100%

elementary school education or less. A larger proportion of the women's fathers (44 per cent) had attended or graduated from high school than the men's fathers (32 per cent), and 28 per cent of the women in comparison with 17 per cent of the men had fathers who had been students at higher institutions of learning.

What about differences in the level of education achieved by the mothers of men and women principals? Do they differ in this respect, too? We found that they do not: the modal category for the mothers of both men and women is that of graduation from or attendance at high school. Almost half of the mothers of the sample (45 per cent of the women's and 47 per cent of the men's) were in this group (Table 2-7).

As another general indicator of their class origins, we asked the principals: "What was the income position of your parents [in your community] at the time of your graduation from high school?" (See Table 2-8.) Almost half (48 per cent) of both the men and women principals classified their families as being in the third lowest of four categories of family income. Forty-two per cent of the women and 37 per cent of the men principals reported their families were in the two highest income groups. The tendency for women principals to be from somewhat higher socio-economic backgrounds than men appears again, although the difference in this instance is very small and not as pronounced as in the case of father's occupation and education.

Do men and women who serve as elementary principals in cities of 50,000 population or over differ as to the type of community in which they spent most of their youth? Our data show that the women somewhat more frequently than men came from large cities (48 per cent vs. 39 per

Table 2-7. Percentage Distribution of the Education of the Mothers of Women and Men Principals

Mother's Education	Women (N=91)	Men (N=98)
No formal education	5%	3%
Completed elementary school or some elementary school	33	37
Graduated from high school or some high school	45	47
Some college	14	10
Graduated from college	3	2
Graduate or professional school	-	1
	100%	100%

Table 2-8. Percentage Distribution of the Income Position of the Parents of Women and Men Principals at Time of Principal's High School Graduation

Income Position of Parents	Women (N=90)	Men (N=98)
Highest 25% of community	9%	12%
Second highest 25% of community	33	25
Third highest 25% of community	48	48
Lowest 25% of community	10	15
	100%	100%

cent), and that slightly more men (20 per cent) than women (13 per cent) grew up in farm areas. A look at the community origins of different age groups is of interest. For the men, as might be expected in view of the steady decline of the farm population, the proportion coming from farms is decreasing: 36 per cent of the old, but only 11 per cent of the young. The proportion of men from large cities, however, has increased: 29 per cent of the old, but 45 per cent of the young. Among women principals, no clear-cut trends are apparent, except for a decreasing proportion of women from small cities. What does clearly emerge from Table 2-9 is that the majority of both men and women principals come from urban communities.

Men and women principals, then, are similar in some but different in other of their social characteristics. Women principals tend to be from occupational origins that enjoy higher status than men. The fathers of women principals also have had more education, on the average, than those of the men. The educational origins of men and women principals' mothers, however, are highly similar. Further, men and women do not differ greatly in the position of their families as to parental income or in community origin. In combination, these findings show the women principals as coming from families of somewhat higher status than the men.

Educational Backgrounds

Do men and women elementary school principals differ in the types of elementary and secondary school they attended? Are there sex

differences in the quality of their performance as students? Did they attend similar or different types of undergraduate and graduate institutions of higher learning?

The men and the women who have chosen to pursue a career in public education are themselves predominantly the product of it: 87 per cent of the women and 93 per cent of the men report that they received most of their elementary education in the public schools, and 94 per cent of the women and 88 per cent of the men said they attended public secondary schools (Table 2-10).

According to their own assessment, women principals generally made better academic records in secondary school than did their male counterparts (Table 2-11): 86 per cent of the women, in contrast to 68 per cent of the men, reported that their school work was "above average" or "way above average." Over twice as many men as women (31 per cent vs. 14 per cent) evaluated their work as "average."

Next we turn to four aspects of their undergraduate experiences: the type of college attended, the number of semester hours of education courses, quality of academic work, and mode of study, i.e., part- or full-time.

Did men and women principals attend the same type of college? Our data indicate they did not (Table 2-12). In the first place, twice as many women as men (60 per cent vs. 31 per cent) attended state teachers' colleges or normal schools. Secondly, twice as many men as women (29 per cent vs. 14 per cent) were students at private institutions. Furthermore, nearly twice as many men as women studied at state universities (24 per cent vs. 13 per cent). The differences between the

Table 2-10. Percentage Distribution of Type of Elementary and Secondary School Attended by Women and Men Principals

Type of School	Women		Men	
	Elementary (N=91)	Secondary (N=91)	Elementary (N=98)	Secondary (N=97)
Public	87%	94%	93%	88%
Parochial	12	3	5	5
Private	1	3	2	7
	100%	100%	100%	100%

Table 2-11. Percentage Distribution of Quality of Academic Work in
Secondary School of Women and Men Principals

Quality of Academic Work	Women (N=91)	Men (N=97)
Way above average	23%	12%
Above average	63	56
Average	14	31
Somewhat below average	-	1
	100%	100%

Table 2-12. Percentage Distribution of Type of Undergraduate College Attended by Women and Men Principals

Type of Undergraduate College	Women (N=91)	Men (N=98)
State university	13%	24%
State teachers college or normal school	50	29
Other public college or university	10	16
Private university	11	14
Private teachers college or normal school	1	4
Other private college	2	11
Half at state teachers college, half at other type of institution	10	2
Other combinations	3	-
	100%	100%

proportion of men and women who attended private universities and private teachers' colleges were very small, but these two categories include only a minority of the total sample. A question arises about these findings in connection with one reported earlier in this chapter: fathers' occupational status tended to be lower for men principals than for women, yet a larger proportion of the men attended private institutions. Women principals predominantly attended public colleges, primarily state teachers' colleges and normal schools. What might account for this apparent disparity? The image of teaching as a woman's profession and the appropriateness of teachers' colleges as a place of training for it, particularly for daughters in the lower middle-class families from which principals mainly come, may explain the women's undergraduate origins. We might further speculate that families assign greater importance to a college education for their sons than their daughters, and hence are more willing to sacrifice to send a son to a private institution.⁸ That the men have more frequently attended private undergraduate institutions rather than undergraduate professional schools may also indicate that they had other careers besides teaching in mind when they were in college, a possibility that we shall explore later.

Semester hours of undergraduate courses in education can be viewed as one measure of formal preparation for a career in education. Table 2-13 shows that women principals as undergraduates had more education courses than men: over twice as many women as men (29 per cent vs. 13 per cent) had more than 60 hours of them. Since twice the proportion

Table 2-13. Percentage Distribution of Semester Hours of Undergraduate Education Courses Taken by Women and Men Principals

Semester Hours	Women (N=86)	Men (N=97)
None	1%	5%
1 - 10	-	5
11 - 20	12	18
21 - 30	17	30
31 - 40	19	17
41 - 50	13	6
51 - 60	9	6
More than 60 hours	29	13
	100%	100%

of women attended state normal schools or teachers' colleges, this finding is not unexpected. It does provide further evidence that type of undergraduate institution and course hours of undergraduate education may be indices of early choice of education as a profession.

On the secondary level, the women generally were better students than the men. Was this true when they were undergraduates? Yes: 83 per cent of the women, as contrasted with 67 per cent of the men, reported that their academic work was "above average" or that they graduated with honors. And, conversely, almost twice as many men as women (32 per cent vs. 17 per cent) said their work in college was "average" (Table 2-14).

Although for both groups, full-time study was the dominant mode of study, men were more likely than women to have been full-time undergraduate students: 82 per cent of the men in contrast to 67 per cent of the women (Table 2-15). The larger proportion of women who studied part-time may be ascribed partly to their combination of marriage with part-time study and partly to the type of institution, i.e., normal schools and teachers' colleges. This difference, however, exists in only two of the three age groups: for the oldest and youngest principals. The sharpest difference occurs in the "old" group, of whom 75 per cent of the men, in contrast to 54 per cent of the women, studied full-time. This particular finding probably reflects the time when the normal schools provided teacher-training programs of from one to three years. When women returned to complete the Bachelor's degree later in their careers, as professional requirements became more strict, they probably did so on a part-time basis. What may account for the

Table 2-14. Percentage Distribution of Quality of Academic Work in
College of Women and Men Principals

Quality of Academic Work	Women (N=91)	Men (N=98)
Graduated with honors	20%	8%
Above average	63	59
Average	17	32
Somewhat below average	-	1
	100%	100%

Table 2-15. Percentage Distribution of Mode of Undergraduate Study of Women and Men Principals by Age

	Age				All Cases	
	Young (25-45)		Middle (46-55)		Old (56-70)	
	Women (N=11)	Men (N=37)	Women (N=31)	Men (N=31)	Women (N=41)	Men (N=28)
Mode of Undergraduate Study						
					Women (N=83)	Men (N=96)
Full-time	82%	95%	81%	74%	54%	75%
Part-time	18	5	19	26	46	25
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

greater proportion of the women than the men in the "middle" group who had taken full-time undergraduate study (81 per cent vs. 74 per cent) is not readily apparent.

Graduate study is the rule, rather than the exception, among the principals: of the 91 women and 98 men who answered the question about it, only two women and one man had not completed some graduate work. So we next turn to possible sex differences in five aspects of their graduate study: the highest academic degrees received, the type of institution, the hours of courses in education and educational administration, and the mode of study, i.e., part- or full-time.

The great majority of both men and women principals have the Master's degree: 85 per cent of the women and 86 per cent of the men (Table 2-16). This is undoubtedly the outcome of the academic requirements for the principalship in large city systems: a Master's degree is typically a basic requisite.

We have seen that men and women principals differed in the type of undergraduate institution at which they had studied. Do they also differ as to type of graduate institution? In addition, do men and women attend the same type of school as graduate students that they did as undergraduates? Table 2-17 indicates two major differences between men and women in their graduate training: first, over twice as many men as women principals (41 per cent vs. 19 per cent) studied at state universities; and second, a larger proportion of women than men principals (42 per cent vs. 29 per cent) were at private universities. The proportions of both men and women who were students at state teachers' colleges, other public colleges or universities, private teachers'

Table 2-16. Percentage Distribution of Highest Academic Degree
Received by Women and Men Principals

Highest Academic Degree	Women (N=91)	Men (N=98)
Certificate	3%	0%
Bachelor	9	9
Master	85	86
Doctorate	3	5
	100%	100%

Table 2-17. Percentage Distribution of Type of Graduate Institution
Attended by Women and Men Principals

Type of Graduate Institution	Women (N=84)	Men (N=96)
State university	19%	41%
State teachers college or normal school	9	4
Other public college or university	21	17
Private university	42	29
Private teachers college or normal school	4	5
Other private school	5	4
	100%	100%

colleges, and "other private schools" are relatively similar. On the graduate level, the modal type of institution for women principals is the private university; for men, it is the state university. When we compare the proportions of men and women attending different types of graduate and undergraduate institutions, we find some interesting differences (Tables 2-17 and 2-12). As undergraduates, 29 per cent of the men, but only 14 per cent of the women, attended private as opposed to public institutions. As graduates, the situation is reversed: 51 per cent of the women, but 38 per cent of the men, studied at private institutions. Moreover, the proportion of both sexes who studied at a state teachers' college sharply decreased in passing from undergraduate to graduate study. While 60 per cent of the women attended this type of college as undergraduates, only nine per cent did so as graduate students. The comparable figures for men principals are 31 per cent for undergraduate and four per cent for graduate work. The men principals' pattern also shows other changes: 24 per cent of them attended a state university as undergraduates while 41 per cent did so as graduate students, and 14 per cent did their undergraduate work at a private university, but 29 per cent did graduate work at such institutions. Among women principals, one other finding deserves note: 10 per cent of them attended "other public college or university" as undergraduates in contrast with 21 per cent as graduate students.

Why should attendance at state teachers' colleges drop off so noticeably at the graduate level? One possible explanation is that many teachers' colleges do not have graduate departments and cannot award graduate degrees. This would account for the greater attendance

at universities, private and state. Universities usually have larger departments of education or graduate schools and hence offer more courses, both in number and type, than institutions designated as "colleges." Concerning the preference of women for private universities and of men for state universities, no explanation comes easily to mind.

Taking into account professional standards and school system requirements, we would expect both men and women principals to have "majored" in education on the graduate level and, indeed, this is the case (Table 2-18). Eighty-six per cent of the men, and 84 per cent of the women principals have taken 21 hours or more of graduate courses in education. The men tend to have somewhat more semester hours of such courses than the women: 32 per cent of the men but 22 per cent of the women have taken 51 or more hours. Since women took more education courses as undergraduates, this may be explained by the men's making up the deficiency belatedly.

Within the field of education, we anticipated that principals would more or less specialize in administration. Table 2-19 shows that 85 per cent of the men and 75 per cent of the women have taken 11 or more hours in it. Men principals generally have taken more administration courses than women: 57 per cent of the men, but only 36 per cent of the women, have had more than 20 semester hours in administration. This difference may indicate that the men are preparing for further advancement in school administration. We would expect that principals interested in higher administrative positions might take more such courses, either to satisfy system requirement for promotion or to prepare themselves for such jobs.

Table 2-18. Percentage Distribution of Semester Hours of Graduate Education Courses Taken by Women and Men Principals

Semester Hours	Women (N=86)	Men (N=96)
None	-	1%
1 - 10	6%	2
11 - 20	10	11
21 - 30	20	18
31 - 40	30	26
41 - 50	12	10
51 - 60	5	16
More than 60	17	16
	100%	100%

Table 2-19. Percentage Distribution of Semester Hours of Administration Courses Taken by Women and Men Principals

Semester Hours	Women (N=89)	Men (N=97)
None	1%	2%
1 - 10	24	13
11 - 20	39	28
21 - 30	20	31
31 - 40	6	11
41 - 50	3	9
51 - 60	2	1
More than 60	5	5
	100%	100%

The predominant mode of study on the graduate level for both men and women principals is part-time study. Only 20 per cent of the men and six per cent of the women report full-time study in that phase of their careers (Table 2-20). The greater proportion of men who were full-time students cannot be ascribed to financial support received from the GI Bill, since only six of the 19 men involved were eligible for its benefits as veterans. We might speculate that the greater importance of occupational advancement to men, with its requirement of further academic study, results in their undertaking more concentrated study; or that the men can be supported by wives and thus are in a better financial position to study full-time.

In summary, the men and women elementary school principals in our sample are themselves predominantly the products of public schools. Women, on the average, had better academic records in secondary school. As undergraduates, a large majority of the women studied at state teachers' colleges or normal schools, while the men attended a wide variety of institutions. Women principals had more hours of education courses in college than the men, and again women tended to be the better students.

Almost all the principals, both men and women, have done graduate study and most of them hold the Master's degree. On the graduate, in contrast to the undergraduate level, part-time study predominates, with men more likely than women to study full-time. The proportion of both men and women who studied at a state teachers' college sharply decreases from the undergraduate to the graduate level. The modal type of graduate

Table 2-20. Percentage Distribution of Mode of Graduate Study of
Women and Men Principals

Mode of Graduate Study	Women (N=88)	Men (N=96)
Full-time	6%	20%
Part-time	94	80
	100%	100%

2-34

institution for women is the private university and for men the state university. We also found that men principals have taken more hours of courses in educational administration than women.

Notes and References for Chapter Two

1. See for example Natalie Rogoff, "The Decision to Study Medicine," and Wagner Thielens, Jr., "Some Comparisons of Entrants to Medical and Law School," in Robert K. Merton, George Reader, and Patricia L. Kendall, The Student-Physician (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), pp. 109-129 and pp. 131-152; also Howard S. Becker, et al., Boys in White (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961). For a general discussion of the characteristics of recruits to different occupations, see Edward Gross, Work and Society (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958), Chapter V.
2. This reasoning also assumes of course that age is negatively associated with worry.
3. The 1958 study of elementary principals conducted by the Department of Elementary School Principals (DESP) also found that women principals were older on the average than men: the median age of women supervising principals was 52.1 and of men 43.7. A comparison of the DESP findings with those of our sample reveals that the elementary principals in the National Principalship Study, both men and women, tend to be somewhat older than those in the DESP study. ("The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study," Thirty-seventh Yearbook, The National Elementary Principal, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association [1958], p. 111.) While Hemphill et al. did not use a random sample in their study of elementary principals, they found that the mean age of the women principals in their inquiry was 51.6 and of the men, 42.2. (John K. Hemphill, et al., Administrative

Performance and Personality [New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1962], p. 65).

4. For a discussion of characteristics of women in the labor force, see Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), pp. 234-237.

5. Hemphill et al. interpreted their findings on the social origins of men and women principals as follows: "It appears that the social origins of the older women principals in this study are of somewhat higher status or that the men principals are now being drawn from lower socioeconomic groups." (Hemphill et al., op. cit., pp. 67-68.)

6. Ward S. Mason, The Beginning Teacher: Status and Career Orientations (Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1961), pp. 11-13; and Lindley J. Stiles (Ed.), The Teacher's Role in American Society (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1957), Chapters II, III, and IV.

7. Mason, op. cit., p. 12.

8. Our examination of the type of undergraduate institution attended by the men according to their age revealed that subsidization of college attendance by the GI Bill, which would have minimized the effect of the financial factor, does not account for this difference. The distribution of type of undergraduate school attended by men in the "young" group, which would have been most affected by the GI Bill, actually shows a decrease in attendance at private institutions.

Chapter 3: Careers

The small number of occupations with relatively balanced sex ratios, such as the principalship in elementary schools, provides a locus for examining whether there are sociological and practically significant differences between men's and women's careers--in the timing, context, and motivation of choice and decision, in occupational aspiration, in commitment to specific roles, and, in the case of professions, to the profession itself. In this chapter we consider how sex enters into the decision to become a teacher and to become a principal, and sequences in the career; in the next, we examine the occupational aspirations of the men and women in our sample.

Those who become administrators in the elementary schools will have faced two key decisions: first, to become a teacher, and then to become a principal. Because men and women assign different importance to a career in our society as well as to the prestige of teaching as a profession,¹ we predicted that: (1) women consider and decide on teaching as their career earlier than men; (2) women are more strongly attracted to teaching as a profession than men; (3) women receive greater encouragement than men to choose teaching as a career; and (4) women encounter less discouragement than men in making the choice.

We predicted that, once in the profession, because of the greater desire of men for occupational mobility and the prevalent attitudes towards women in positions of authority²: (1) men decide to become principals earlier than women; (2) men are more strongly attracted to the principalship than women; (3) men specify mobility more often than women as a motive for seeking the principalship; and (4) women are both

encouraged and discouraged more than men to become principals.

These predictions imply differences in the sequences in the careers of men and women principals. Specifically, we expected the males to have been teachers for a shorter period of time, and to have had less experience as elementary school teachers than the females.

Here we present the findings bearing on our predictions, a number of which serve as assumptions for further hypotheses, to be tested in later chapters. We shall also explore the relationship of sex to other aspects of decisions and patterns in careers on which empirical data is limited--for example, the sources of encouragement and discouragement of their decisions and the routes by which men and women become principals. The first section of the chapter deals with the decisions of men and women school administrators to become teachers and the second with their decisions to become principals; the final section considers their career histories.

The Decision to Become a Teacher

The Timing: Initial Consideration and Final Decision

In studying the timing of the decision to become a teacher, we looked into when the men and women principals first considered choosing teaching as a possible career and when they finally decided to become teachers. Because teaching is generally thought of as a woman's occupation and is more attractive in remuneration and prestige to women than to men, we predicted that the women both considered and chose teaching as a career earlier than the men. Looking first at the point

at which teaching was first considered, do the data support our prediction?

They do: on the average, women consider teaching as a profession much earlier than men. In recalling when the idea of teaching first occurred to them, almost two-thirds of the women (65 per cent) replied "in grammar school," but only one-tenth (11 per cent) of the men had considered it so early. Put another way, 44 per cent of the men, in contrast to 10 per cent of the women, replied that they had not considered teaching as a possible career until they were in or had completed college (Table 3-1).

Do women also make their final decision to become teachers earlier than men? The answer is an unequivocal "yes." Seventy-six per cent of the women, but only 27 per cent of the men, replied that they had decided by the time they had completed high school: or, looked at the other way, 42 per cent of the men but only 7 per cent of the women reported they had not finally decided on teaching until their junior or senior year in college, or even later (Table 3-2).

We should comment here on a possible misinterpretation of our findings. In discussing medical students, Rogoff states: ". . .the pressure to assume an occupational role is undoubtedly stronger on men than on women, and the latter may postpone active deliberation about a career somewhat longer."³ Yet, in our sample, men principals decided much later on teaching than did women. Does this mean that Rogoff's observation is incorrect because it differs from our findings? Not necessarily. Our findings refer to considerations and decisions about

Table 3-1. Time at Which Men and Women Principals Initially Considered Teaching as a Career

(N = 177)*

Time of Initial Consideration	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Grammar school	54	65%	10	11%
High school--freshman or sophomore year	4	5	10	11
High school--junior or senior year	17	20	26	28
Between high school and college	--	--	6	6
College--freshman or sophomore year	5	6	27	29
College--junior or senior year	2	2	8	9
After college	2	2	6	6
	84	100%	93	100%

* Data unavailable for 12 of the 189 principals.

 $\chi^2 = 61.47$, 6 df, $p < .001$.^a^aOne-tailed p value.

Table 3-2. Time at Which Men and Women Principals Made Final Decision to Become a Teacher

(N = 180)*

Time of Final Decision	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Grammar school	13	15%	3	3%
High school--freshman or sophomore year	9	11	2	2
High school--junior or senior year	43	50	21	22
Between high school and college	1	1	8	9
College--freshman or sophomore year	14	16	21	22
College--junior or senior year	1	1	23	25
After college	5	6	16	17
	86	100%	94	100%

* Data unavailable for nine of the 189 principals.

 $\chi^2 = 34.21$, 6 df, $p < .001$.^a^aOne-tailed p value.

a specific profession, teaching, and not about careers in general.

Attraction to Teaching

Although teaching is but one of a large number of professions open to men, it is one of the much fewer easily accessible to women. Because of the relatively higher status of teaching as a profession for women than for men, we predicted that women are the more strongly attracted to it. To measure its attractiveness, we used two indicators: (1) whether teaching was the principals' first choice as an occupation and (2) if, in discussing reasons for deciding on teaching, they mentioned having been not strongly motivated.

The principals' responses to our question, "What really was your first-choice occupation?" supported our prediction. Teaching was the first choice of 80 per cent of the women, but of only 46 per cent of the men (Table 3-3). The men for whom teaching was not the first preference typically mentioned a profession with higher status: 21 per cent mentioned medicine; 10 per cent law; 6 per cent, business. The preferences of women for whom teaching was not the first choice included a range of occupations: most frequently mentioned was law, a response given by 5 per cent of them.⁴

To learn why the principals who preferred other professions did not enter them, we asked, "Why did you enter teaching if it wasn't your first choice as an occupation?" Since only a minority of the women said that teaching was not their first choice, we shall consider only the responses of the men who had wanted at first to enter another profession: the reason they most frequently cited (63 per cent of them)

Table 3-3. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported That Teaching Was Their First Choice as an Occupation

(N = 188)*

Principal's Report of First-choice Occupation	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Teaching first-choice	73	80%	45	46%
Teaching not first-choice	18	20	52	54
	91	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

$\chi^2 = 23.04$, 1 df, $p < .001$.^a

^aOne-tailed p value.

was lack of money either to prepare for or to enter the preferred occupation (Table 3-4). Typical of their responses to this question were:

M-88: It was a depression and jobs were scarce in those days. I was trained for a draftsman and couldn't continue my education due to financial problems. I answered an ad for a teacher of industrial arts in _____ and to my surprise I was accepted. I had no intention of becoming a teacher.

M-64: My mother was a six-day a week domestic. She literally scrubbed the way of her children through college. I wanted to be a surgeon but it was clear that I would not be able to become one because of lack of money. I had no father, and therefore no financial support. I thought the next best thing to do, since I liked to work with people, would be to become a teacher.

M-83: I would have gone into medicine, but I simply didn't have the money.

M-67: I wanted to become a lawyer or a writer but I didn't have the money for either of these activities so I decided to choose a temporary occupation until I could get through law school. And so I chose teaching.

M-79: I got out of college very young, and I was not old enough to start medical school which represented my first love. So I took a master's degree in the teaching of science and started

Table 3-4. Reasons Cited by Men Principals Who Initially Wanted to Enter Another Profession Before Becoming a Teacher

(N = 51)*

Reason	Per Cent Who Mentioned
Lack of money to prepare for or to enter preferred occupation	6%
Lack of employment opportunities	10
Lack of requisite aptitudes or abilities	12
Limited opportunities for advancement in preferred occupation	6
Lack of adequate guidance	2
Other reasons	7

* One of the 52 male principals did not answer this question.

to teach and then stayed in. It was necessary and important to keep my teaching job. Four years of medical school looked tough because it was so expensive, and the money that was already coming in was a considerable help to my family.

Other reasons such as few opportunities for advancement or employment or lack of the requisite aptitudes and abilities were cited but less than 11 per cent of the men mentioned any single one of them.

Next, we turn to the second indicator of the principals' attraction to education: if, in discussing their decision, they mentioned having been not highly motivated to enter teaching. Fifty-nine per cent of the men but only 22 per cent of the women specifically cited the absence of strong attraction to it (Table 3-5). The data clearly support our prediction that women principals were more strongly attracted and more highly motivated to a career in teaching than men.

Personal Influence: Encouragement and Discouragement

An important element in motivation may be the influence or encouragement of "significant others." Because of the differential status of teaching as a profession for men and for women, we predicted that women receive more encouragement to enter it than men. Is this actually the case? When we asked the principals if there were any persons who especially encouraged them in their decision, only a slightly larger percentage of the women (80 per cent) than the men (73 per cent) acknowledged it (Table 3-6). Since the difference in their responses is not statistically significant at below the .05 level, we conclude that our prediction is not supported.

Table 3-5. Percentage of Men and Women Principals Who Mentioned Not Having Been Highly Motivated to Enter Teaching

(N = 188)*

Mention of Not Having Been Highly Motivated	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	20	22%	57	59%
No	71	78	40	41
	91	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

$\chi^2 = 26.39$, 1 df, $p < .001$.^a

^aOne-tailed p value.

Table 3-6. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Responded That They Had Received Special Encouragement to Enter Teaching

(N = 188)*

Mention of Special Encouragement	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	73	80%	71	73%
No	18	20	26	27
	91	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

$\chi^2 = 1.29$, 1 df, $p > .05$.^a

^aOne-tailed p value.

The simple fact of encouragement, however, may not be as important to occupational choice as encouragement by particular individuals, such as, parents or peers. Let us explore this possibility. Did men and women principals receive differential encouragement to become teachers from their parents and other "significant others"?

When we look at sources of encouragement, some interesting differences between the sexes are brought to light. Over twice as many women as men (55 per cent vs. 26 per cent) reported being encouraged by one or both parents (Table 3-7). Evidently the parents' image of teaching is such as to make them more disposed to encourage their daughters than their sons to choose it. But 45 per cent of the men and 35 per cent of the women reported encouragement from people in the profession. A slightly greater proportion of women than men mentioned encouragement by teachers, while a slightly larger proportion of men than women cited professors and others in higher education. The latter finding is probably related to the later decision of the men who made their choice during or following their undergraduate days. These findings suggest that certain types of individuals do exert more influence on the career decision than others and that a given category of person may have on significance for men and another for women principals.

In deciding on a career, being discouraged may have the same or a greater effect than being encouraged. Again, because the evaluation of education as a profession differs according to sex, we predicted that more men would report being discouraged from entering teaching than women. Our prediction is supported: a significantly larger

Table 3-7. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Encouragement of the Decision to Become a Teacher

(N = 188)*

Sources of Encouragement	Women (N=91)	Men (N=97)
<u>Family</u>	75% ^a	51% ^a
Mother	21	11
Father	6	9
Both parents	28	6
Wife/husband	--	7
Other relatives	15	16
Family in general	9	7
<u>Professionals</u>	35% ^a	45% ^a
Teacher	25	18
Professor or college teacher	6	11
Principal	1	6
Superintendent	4	5
Other professionals	1	8
<u>Friends</u>	4%	10%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

^a Responses do not add to category total since some respondents mentioned more than one source of encouragement.

proportion of men reported being discouraged than women (Table 3-8).

Who discouraged men and women principals from teaching? Are the categories the same for men as for women? The number of principals citing specific individuals who discouraged them is so small that our interpretation of the findings must be cautious (Table 3-9). There are no marked differences in source: both the men and the women most often mentioned members of their families as having attempted to dissuade them. Consistently, though, the proportion of men principals who were discouraged by family, professionals, and friends is greater than of women principals.

Summary and Discussion

To this point our findings have shown that (1) women in the principalship both considered and chose teaching for their profession earlier than men; (2) teaching as a career was more attractive to the women than the men; and (3) more men were discouraged from entering teaching than women. The data, however, did not confirm our prediction that women would receive more encouragement than men to choose teaching.

The striking differences between men and women in the timing and the motivation of deciding to enter teaching raise questions about the academic quality of late deciders and about the circumstances in addition to occupational status, such as their contacts with the profession and reactions to models of the teaching role, which could account for the divergent orientation of men and women to this calling.

First, what is the academic quality of late deciders? There is an old saying that "those who can, do; those who can't, teach." Could

Table 3-8. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Being Discouraged from Entering Teaching

(N = 188)*

Report of Discouragement	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	13	14%	30	31%
No	78	86	67	69
	91	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

 $\chi^2 = 7.34$, 1 df, $p < .01$.^a^aOne-tailed p value.

Table 3-9. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Discouragement of the Decision to Become a Teacher

(N = 188)*

Sources of Discouragement	Women (N=91)	Men (N=97)
Family	8%	15%
Professionals	3	9
Friends	2	10

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

this be true of the late deciders, in particular the men for whom teaching is largely a second choice? That is, were the men who turned to teaching those who lacked the requisite academic ability to engage in the occupation or profession which was their first choice? It is plausible that the most frequent reason given for not entering upon their first choice, financial limitations, may not have been the real reason but only a rationalization. To explore this possibility, we cross-tabulated the men's reports of their high school academic records against the point at which they first considered teaching as a career (Table 3-10). This revealed that the men who considered teaching later did not differ significantly in their academic records from those who had thought of it earlier. The late deciders among men, then, are not less academically able than the early and their belated consideration of teaching cannot be attributed to their poorer scholastic records.⁵

Next, what effect could contact with the profession and with role models have on the decision? Thielens⁶ suggests that increased familiarity or contact with an occupational role facilitates earlier commitment to it, and he cites the closer contact of medical students with their future profession as one circumstance producing in them, in comparison with law students, an earlier commitment to professional school. He points out that the doctor's role is ". . . a matter of direct experience and knowledge to a greater extent. . ."⁷ than the lawyer's. Based on this reasoning, we would expect men and women to make a commitment to education at approximately the same time since they have had the same degree of familiarity with it. But, as we have

Table 3-10. Time at Which Men Principals Initially Considered Teaching as a Career by High School Grades

(N = 93)*

High School Grades	Time of Initial Consideration			
	Before College		During/after College	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Above average	32	62%	32	78%
Average or below	20	38	9	22
	52	100%	41	100%

* Data unavailable for five of the 98 male principals.

$\chi^2 = 2.93$, 1 df, $p > .05$.^a

^aTwo-tailed p value.

seen, this is clearly not the case. Rather, our findings suggest that the way individuals evaluate occupations or professions may be more important than contact in influencing the timing of the decision.

Another possible reason for the difference in attitudes of men toward teaching may be the sex of the role models they see. Elementary schools are staffed predominantly by women; in high schools, the ratio of men to women teachers is more nearly equal. From what we know about the process of psycho-social development and identity-formation in children and adolescents,⁸ we would expect that role models would typically be of the same sex as the prospective recruit. The sex distribution within the profession in the elementary school probably facilitates the early choice by women of a model and of teaching while it retards it in the men. This could explain in part why most women and so few men had considered teaching in elementary school. At that point, the women principals could readily have chosen teaching as a "fantasy choice," inspired by the example of numerous models of the same sex; and in time, it could become their actual choice. We might also speculate that the compulsive masculinity characteristic of boys in elementary school may engender in them an unfavorable reaction to their women teachers and to their stereotyping of teaching as a "woman's" job.

What accounts for the selection of teaching as the alternative profession by the principals, especially the men, who were unable to pursue their original ambition? We suggest the answer: teaching is an easily accessible profession to individuals who go to college and find it difficult or impossible to enter the career of their first

choice or who delay in deciding on a career. Education as a profession does not require a highly specialized course of preparation and training, as do, say, medicine or law. Particularly at the time when many of the principals in our sample were beginning their careers, the licensing or certification of teachers was lax and even non-existent in some states. Frequently, a college degree or normal school certificate was the only formal requirement for a teaching position. Because of the openness of the profession, a college graduate could make the decision to enter it belatedly--in the final undergraduate years or even after graduation. A similarly deferred decision to enter medicine or law would entail much greater difficulty because of the more stringent requirements for admission to medical or law school.⁹ Thus education was an easily entered profession, probably the easiest profession for those who could not achieve the one they desired, because it required little or no additional specialized training. This characteristic permitted and accommodated late deciders.

The findings presented in this section suggest a tentative interpretation of the differences between men and women in the timing and mode of their decision to enter teaching. The relatively poor financial return and low social status of teaching as a profession combined with the image of it as pre-eminently a woman's occupation and the relative scarcity of models of the same sex in their early youth dispose the men initially toward professions commanding higher prestige. Then situational factors, generally financial, exert a crucial influence on the decision, requiring the re-thinking of plans and leading

to the late consideration and choice of teaching as a profession. This belated choice is facilitated by the absence of highly specialized prerequisite study and training. With the women the situation is quite different. In frequent contact, from elementary school on, with teachers of the same sex who may function as role models, and influenced by the view that teaching is a "good" profession for a woman, they evaluate teaching more favorably than men and identify themselves much earlier with it. The influence and persuasion of their parents and teachers reinforce the evaluation and as a consequence they consider and finally decide on teaching much earlier than men.

The decision to become a teacher was the first key decision of the principals in our sample. Now we turn our attention to the second: the decision to become a principal.

The Decision to Become a Principal

The Timing

Once the initial career decision to enter the profession had been made, we predicted that the men would decide earlier than the women to become principals. Their greater aspiration for occupational mobility, we reasoned, would incline them towards the principalship sooner than their female counterparts, since in teaching the main avenue of upward movement and promotion is vertical, through administration.

Forty-three per cent of the men but only 13 per cent of the women said that they had seriously considered the principalship at the age of 25 or earlier. Over twice as many men as women (74 per cent vs. 33 per

cent) had seriously thought of it by the age of 30 (Table 3-11). And by the age of 35, 91 per cent of the men had entertained the idea, in contrast to 59 per cent of the women.¹⁰ Our prediction was supported.

With the principalship, then, the situation is the reverse of that of teaching: women consider teaching much earlier than men but men think about becoming principals much earlier than women. The early interest of the men is the more striking when we recall their generally later decision to enter teaching.

Attraction and Motivation

The greater importance of occupational mobility to men, in association with the less favorable attitudes in our society towards women holding positions of authority, led us to predict that the men were more attracted to the principalship than the women. As a negative indicator of attraction, we used their report--if they made one--of no definite motivation or of accidental reasons in discussing why they wanted to become a principal. Examples of their responses are:

W-436: I never thought of [becoming a principal]. In my second year of teaching the principal became ill. The superintendent and the supervisor asked me to take over as acting principal. I was kind of pushed into it. I did not want to be, but accepted under strong encouragement from my aunt and school officials.

W-337: The superintendent offered me the job. . . . If the offer hadn't come, I would still be teaching.

Table 3-11. Age at Which Women and Men Principals Reported They First Considered Becoming a Principal

(N = 172)*

Age	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
20 or under	3	4%	9	10%
21 - 25	7	9	30	33
26 - 30	18	22	28	31
31 - 35	20	24	15	17
36 - 40	14	17	5	6
41 - 45	15	18	2	2
46 - 50	3	4	1	1
51 and over	+{ 2	2	+{ --	--
	82	100%	90	100%

* Five women and one man responded that they never considered the principalship before they were asked to become a principal. The data were unavailable for four women and seven men.

+ For purposes of computing chi-square, these categories were combined.

$\chi^2 = 96.40$, 6 df, $p < .001$.^a

^aOne-tailed p value.

W-383: My principal had a serious illness and I took over her office. She died during the year and I kept the office that year. I was pushed in by accident--and liked it.

More women than men mentioned lacking motivation or the intrusion of accident in their becoming principals (35 per cent vs. 23 per cent) and the finding is statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 3-12). We conclude that the evidence provides support for our prediction that the men would be more attracted to the principalship than the women.

Were we correct in presuming that a greater desire for occupational mobility on the part of men than women was an important reason for the former's earlier interest in the principalship? In reply to the question, "Why did you want to become a principal?" 36 per cent of the men in comparison with 23 per cent of the women mentioned the desire for upward mobility (Table 3-13). The difference was in the predicted direction and is statistically significant at below the .05 level; the prediction receives support. Typical replies of the men were:

M-216: It was the only possible chance for advancement. I was as far as I could go.

M-482: This is the ultimate goal of any young man who goes into teaching. I started to prepare for it in my second year of teaching. I think I wanted to reach the highest point of achievement.

It is interesting to note that over twice as many men as women

Table 3-12. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Mentioned Lack of Motivation or Accidental Factors in Discussing Reasons for Becoming a Principal

(N = 189)

Mention of Lack of Motivation or Accidental Factors	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	32	39%	23	23%
No	59	65	75	77
	91	100%	98	100%

$$\chi^2 = 3.11, 1 \text{ df}, p < .05.^a$$

^aOne-tailed p value.

Table 3-13. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Mentioned
Mobility as a Reason for Wanting to
Become a Principal

(N = 187)*

Mention of Mobility	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	21	23%	35	36%
No	69	77	62	64
	90	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

$\chi^2 = 3.59, 1 \text{ df}, p < .05.^a$

^aOne-tailed p value.

(51 per cent vs. 23 per cent) cited financial reasons (Table 3-14).

Some representative responses were:

M-196: At that time it was money--there was more money than in teaching.

M-330: First and foremost [it was] a matter of economics. I needed to make a living. If the salary had been high enough I probably would have been satisfied to remain a teacher.

Comparing the frequency with which the men mentioned mobility and financial incentives, we found that the monetary rewards associated with mobility were more important than mobility itself to them, but not to the women.

The three reasons for becoming a principal most frequently mentioned by men were: financial motives (51 per cent), positive aspects of the principal's work (41 per cent), and mobility (36 per cent) (Table 3-14). Of the women, they were the influence or persuasion of others (54 per cent), positive aspects of the work (37 per cent), and accidental circumstances (35 per cent).

The finding that the men in our sample were more attracted to the principalship than the women raises the question: are there differences according to sex in our sample in the encouragement they received to become principals?

Personal Influence: Encouragement and Discouragement

We predicted that women more frequently than men would report being encouraged to become principals. Why? The principal is the

Table 3-14. Percentage Distribution of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the Question: Why Did You Want to Become a Principal?

(N = 187)^a

Response Category	Women (N=90)	Men (N=97)
Financial reasons	23 ^b	51 ^b
Mobility	23	36
Greater service to education	19	21
Ability to do job	27	28
Influence or persuasion of others	5 ^b	26
Accidental reasons, no clear motivation	35	23
Positive aspects of principal's work	37	41
Negative aspects of teaching	11	6

^a Responses do not add to 100% since respondents frequently mentioned more than one reason.

^b Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

administrator of the individual school unit. As such, he directs the operation of his school and is responsible for the performance of the teachers in his building. In most organizations, the work of supervising other workers, regardless of level of skills, has been formally or informally reserved for men, for reasons more or less directly related to the structure and content of sex roles in the family and occupational spheres.¹¹ There are women in such positions, as witness the women principals in our study, but they are a minority of the women in the world of work. Since most women are probably influenced, to a greater or less extent, by these attitudes toward women in authority, those who achieve such positions are probably driven by strong occupational aspirations considered atypical in women. This, in turn, may be ascribed to individual traits of personality. But it may have been due to the encouragement and urging of colleagues and superiors,¹² a second possibility which leads to the question: were the women in our sample encouraged more frequently than the men to seek administrative positions? Our findings indicated that they were, since a significantly larger proportion of women reported encouragement than did men (Table 3-13). Further support for this conclusion comes from the fact that twice as many women as men (54 per cent vs. 26 per cent) cite the influence or persuasion of others as entering into their decision. (See Table 3-14.)

Next, are the sources of encouragement the same for the two sexes? And to what extent are they similar to those involved in the decision to enter teaching? We shall examine the last question first.

Table 3-15. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Being Encouraged to Become a Principal

(N = 188)*

Report of Being Encouraged	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	81	89%	76	78%
No	10	11	21	22
	91	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

$\chi^2 = 3.87, 1 \text{ df}, p < .05.$ ^a

^aOne-tailed p value.

In the decision to teach, parents were most frequently mentioned by both the men and the women as sources of encouragement. In the decision to become a principal, professional sources of encouragement are most often cited by both sexes (Table 3-16). But there are also sex differences in the frequency with which the two sources were mentioned as encouraging their aiming at the principalship: 32 per cent of the men, but only 20 per cent of the women mention the family. However, 88 per cent of the women in contrast to 71 per cent of the men cite professionals. Within the professional category, there are only slight differences in the proportion of men and women reporting encouragement by teaching colleagues, the superintendent, and professors. But here there are also some interesting differences: 64 per cent of the women in comparison with 51 per cent of the men mention encouragement by their immediate superior, the principal; and over five times as many women (32 per cent) as men (6 per cent) report the support of "other higher administrators," generally system supervisors or staff specialists. Twenty-four per cent of the men cite their wives, making them the second most frequent source of encouragement for them. The sources of encouragement of the women, then, are primarily professional; of the men, professional and familial.

Taking into account the characteristics of women's occupational roles, particularly where they entail the exercise of authority, we predicted that women principals would more frequently report being discouraged than men. From Table 3-17 we see that the evidence does not support our expectation. Although a greater proportion of the women

Table 3-16. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Encouragement of the Decision to Become a Principal

(N = 188)^a

Sources of Encouragement	Women (N=91)	Men (N=97)
<u>Family</u>	30% ^a	33% ^a
One or both parents	6	6
Wife/husband	3	24
Other relatives	0	3
Family in general	1	3
<u>Professionals</u>	80% ^a	71% ^a
Teachers	13	12
Principal	64	51
Superintendent	15	14
Other higher administrator	32	6
Professor or higher educator	8	11
Other professional	4	3
<u>Friends</u>	4%	4%

^a Responses do not add to category total since some respondents mentioned more than one source of encouragement.

^a Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

Table 3-17. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Being Discouraged from Becoming a Principal

(N = 138)*

Report of Being Discouraged	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
Yes	24	26%	16	17%
No	67	74%	81	83%
	91	100%	97	100%

* Data unavailable for one of the 139 principals.

 $\chi^2 = 2.70, 1 \text{ df}, p > .05.^a$ ^aOne-tailed p value.

than the men in our sample indicated they had been discouraged (16 per cent vs. 17 per cent), the difference is not statistically significant at below the .05 level.

But who discourages this decision? Both sexes most frequently mention a professional source (21 per cent of the women and 14 per cent of the men). Within the professional category, the teachers--reported by 12 per cent of the women and 3 per cent of the men--are most often named as discouraging the decision (Table 3-18).

Summary and Discussion

In this section, we have seen that the following predictions were supported: (1) men decide earlier than women to become school principals; (2) men are more strongly attracted to the principalship than women; (3) men specify mobility more than women as a reason for becoming principals; and (4) women more frequently than men receive encouragement to become principals. Our prediction that women more frequently than men are discouraged from the principalship did not receive support at below the .05 level of statistical significance, although the findings were in the predicted direction.

The men tend more than women to emphasize the financial rewards and mobility, the extrinsic elements in the principal's role, as reasons for seeking the principalship. That the influence and persuasion of others and accidental reasons are cited much more often by women than men suggests that they are self-propelled towards promotion and advancement to a lesser extent than the men. That to most women teaching was the early and unequivocal choice of a vocation, and that becoming

Table 3-18. Percentage of Women and Men Principals Who Reported Various Sources of Discouragement of the Decision to Become a Principal

(N = 189)*

Sources of Discouragement	Women (N=91)	Men (N=97)
<u>Family</u>	3%	1%
<u>Professionals</u>	21%	14%
Teachers	12	5
Principal	4	3
Others	5	6
<u>Friends</u>	5%	1%

* Data unavailable for one of the 189 principals.

a principal requires giving up teaching for administration, may explain in part their later decision to become principals. Women may prefer performing the core activity of the profession to such an extent or derive such gratification from it that they are much more reluctant to exchange it for other work activities, though still within the school setting.

Career Histories

Do the findings support our predictions that men in the principalship have less teaching experience in general, as well as less experience in teaching in elementary school, than women? Before examining our evidence, we turn to two other facts about the career patterns of men and women prior to entering the principalship. The first is that nearly all the principals in our sample had had some teaching experience; only two of the 139 administrators--both men--did not. The second is that two kinds of sequences characterize the careers of most of the men and women prior to their being principals: serving as a teacher only and as a teacher and an in-school administrator. (In-school administrator usually means an assistant- or vice-principal.) Eighty-six per cent of the women and 89 per cent of the men followed one or the other of these two patterns, corroborating our understanding that they constitute the main routes to the principalship (Table 3-19).

Now we turn to the findings bearing on our prediction that women in the principalship have had longer teaching experience than men. This indeed is the case as to total teaching experience: over half

Table 3-19. Percentage Distribution of the Career Patterns of Women and Men Principals up to But Not Including First Principalship

(N = 189)*

Career Patterns	Women (N=87)	Men (N=98)
Never a teacher	0%	2%
Teacher only	45	50
Teacher and in-school administrator	41	39
Teacher and system-wide administrator	10	5
Teacher, in-school administrator, and system-wide administrator	4	4
	100%	100%

* Data unavailable for four of the 189 principals.

the women (51 per cent) had taught 16 years or more, but only 14 per cent of the men had taught equally long.¹³ The mean teaching experience of women at all school levels was 15.9 years in comparison with 9.2 years for the men (Table 3-20).

If the elementary school is a specialized institution, different in many important respects from the junior and senior high school, then the administrators' teaching experience in it may be important in influencing the way they carry out their work. Do the data support our prediction that women principals have more teaching experience in the elementary grades than men? They do: almost half of the women (49 per cent) but only six per cent of the men had taught 16 years or longer; only three per cent of the women but 34 per cent of the men had never taught in elementary school at all (Table 3-21). The mean years of elementary teaching experience of women was 14.7 years, but of men only 4.6 years. The possible implications of this sharp difference in teaching experience will be examined in later chapters.

Are there sex-related differences in the administrative experience the men and women bring to the principalship, in the number of years they were teachers before becoming principals, in the age at which they became principals? Do the women and men differ in their experience as principals and in the length of time they have been administrators of their present schools?

Administrative Experience

Although not all teachers who become principals pass through them, there are transitional positions in school systems that serve to

Table 3-20. Percentage Distribution of Total Years of Teaching Experience of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Total Years of Teaching Experience	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
0 years	0	0%	2	2%
1 - 5	7	8	27	28
6 - 10	16	18	37	38
11 - 15	21	23	18	18
16 - 20	18	20	9	9
21 - 25	13	15	4	4
26 or more	14	16	1	1
	89	100%	98	100%
Mean years	15.9		9.2	

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

+ For purposes of computing chi-square, these categories were combined.

 $\chi^2 = 40.60$, 5 df, $p < .001$.^a^aOne-tailed p value.

Table 3-21. Percentage Distribution of Years of Elementary School Teaching Experience of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Years of Elementary Teaching Experience	Women		Men	
	N	Per Cent	N	Per Cent
0 years	3	3%	33	34%
1 - 5	10	11	33	34
6 - 10	16	18	18	18
11 - 15	17	19	8	8
16 - 20	22	25	4	4
21 - 25	10	11	2	2
26 or more	11	13	--	--
	89	100%	98	100%
Mean Years	14.7		4.6	

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

 $\chi^2 = 69.26$, 6 df, $p < .001$.^a^aOne-tailed p value.

introduce and to partially assimilate those who aspire to the principalship to the routines and problems of administering schools. Before becoming principals, 55 per cent of the women and 48 per cent of the men in our sample had some administrative, in addition to teaching, experience. What transitional jobs did they occupy, how long were they in them, and were there any other differences between men and women in this phase of their careers? The main types of transitional administrative positions, classified according to their scope, are in-school and system-wide.

Data presented earlier (Table 3-19) indicate that there is no appreciable difference between men and women in the proportions of each who had both teaching and in-school administrative experience: it is reported by 41 per cent of the women and 39 per cent of the men. Among positions within the in-school administrative category there are some sex differences: more men (26 per cent) than women (16 per cent) were teaching principals, but almost three times as many women (20 per cent) as men (7 per cent) had held other in-school administrative positions, such as, for example, supervising teacher or teacher-in-charge (Table 3-22). The proportion of men and women who had been assistant- or vice-principals was identical, 18 per cent. Very few principals, men or women, had been department chairmen or occupied with guidance and counseling.

There are only very minor differences in the mean number of years the men and women principals had spent in the various jobs and in their total years in all in-school administrative positions. Men and women

Table 3-22. Percentage Distribution and Mean Years of Experience in In-school Administration below the Level of Principal of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

In-school Administrative Experience	Women (N=89)		Men (N=98)	
	Per Cent	Mean years	Per Cent	Mean years
Assistant and/or vice-principal	18%	5.6	18%	4.1
Teaching principal	16	4.9	26	5.4
Department head or chairman	--	--	2	4.5
Guidance and counseling	2	9.0	1	2.0
Other in-school administrative positions (junior principal, supervising teacher)	20	4.1	7	2.7
Total mean years		5.8		4.9

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

principals are, in general, quite similar in the proportion who have had in-school administrative experience and in the amount of it.

As to system-wide administrative experience, how do men and women compare? Supervisor, resource or helping teacher, and district supervisor are examples of positions in this category. Approximately 15 per cent of both the men and the women in our sample had this type of experience, their mean years of it being 4.6 for women and 5.3 for men (Table 3-23). There is only a very slight sex difference here. Fewer of both the men and women claimed it than claimed in-school experience. A possible reason for the difference is that school systems have a much larger number of in-school administrative positions than central office-connected, system-wide jobs.

Years between First Position in Teaching and First Principalship

From what we already know about differences in the age at which men and women decided to become principals and in the length of their teaching experience, we would anticipate that the interval between the first position in teaching and the first principalship would be much greater for women than for men. This expectation is borne out (Table 3-24): there was an interval of 10 years or less between the first job in teaching and the first principalship in the case of almost half of the men (46 per cent) but of only 10 per cent of the women. Sixty-three per cent of the men, in comparison with 33 per cent of the women, became principals in 15 years or sooner, after entering public school teaching. Even more striking is the finding that 27 per cent of the women, in sharp contrast to six per cent of the men, waited 26 years or

Table 3-23. Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in System-wide Administration of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

System-wide Administrative Experience	Women (N=89)	Men (N=98)
Supervisor	7%	3%
Resource or helping teacher	7	3
Superintendent or assistant superintendent in small community	-	4
Supervisor of attendance	-	2
Other	2	1
Mean years	4.6	5.3

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

Table 3-24. Percentage Distribution of Years between First Educational Job and First Principalship of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Years between First Educational Job and First Principalship	Women (N=87)	Men (N=98)
0 years	0%	0%
1 - 5	3	15
6 - 10	7	31
11 - 15	23	17
16 - 20	14	20
21 - 25	26	11
26 or more	27	6
	100%	100%

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

more after their first teaching position to be appointed to their first principalship.

Age at First Becoming Principal

In view of these findings, it comes as no surprise that the women were much older than the men when they reached the principalship: 42 per cent of the men in comparison with only 20 per cent of the women were 35 or younger on first becoming principals; or, put another way, at that point over twice the proportion of women as men (39 per cent vs. 15 per cent) were 46 years old or older (Table 3-25).

Experience in the Principalship

Do the men and women in our sample vary in the number and type of principalships they have held? Forty-five per cent of the women and 33 per cent of the men had held elementary school principalships only before assuming their present positions (Table 3-26). Ten per cent of the men, as compared to only one per cent of the women, had served as secondary principals prior to their present jobs. In the case of over half of both the men and the women in our sample, their present principalship was their first. How much experience had the others had? The mean total years in all principalships prior to their present position was 3.9 years for women and 4.0 for men. Differences between the sexes in total amount of experience as a principal previous to the present position are very small.

The men and women in our sample are on the whole relatively new in their present positions, more men than women being newcomers: 54 per cent of the men and 40 per cent of the women have held their current

Table 3-25. Percentage Distribution of Age on Becoming a Principal for the First Time of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Age on Becoming Principal	Women (N=89)	Men (N=98)
21 - 25	1%	3%
26 - 30	5	15
31 - 35	14	24
36 - 40	22	25
41 - 45	19	18
46 - 50	31	12
51 or older	8	3
	100%	100%

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

Table 3-26. Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in All Types of Principalships Held Prior to Present Position by Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Type of Principalship	Women (N=87)	Men (N=98)
No principalships prior to present	54%	57%
Elementary	45	33
Junior High School	-	-
High School	-	1
Elementary and Junior High School	1	-
Elementary and High School	-	5
Junior High School and High School	-	-
Elementary, Junior High and High School	-	4
	100%	100%
Mean number of years in all principalships in all systems prior to present position	3.9	4.0

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

places less than five years (Table 3-27). At the other extreme, almost twice as many women as men have been in their present job for 16 years or more (15 per cent vs. 8 per cent). The mean number of years the women had been in their present positions was 8.2 years, the men, 6.9 years. The women principals in our sample, then had slightly more experience in their present principalship than did the men.

The difference between men and women in total years of experience in all principalships through 1961 is slight: the mean for the women is 11.9 years and 11.0 for the men. The distribution (Table 3-28) indicates that the proportion of men and women in most categories of experience is similar, except that slightly more men than women (30 per cent vs. 23 per cent) are in the 1-5 year group, and more women (19 per cent) than men (9 per cent) are in the 16-20 year category.

Summary and Discussion

In this section we have found that our predictions that men principals have less teaching experience in the elementary school as well as less total teaching experience than women received empirical support. We have also explored other possible differences in careers between the sexes: in their administrative experience, the number of years they had taught before becoming principals and the age at which they were appointed, and, finally, their experience in previous principalships and in their present positions.

In some respects the career histories of the men and women principals in our sample are similar, but in certain others they are strikingly different. The dominant patterns up to the first principalship

Table 3-27. Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in Present
Principalship of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Number of Years in Present Principalship	Women (N=89)	Men (N=98)
1 - 5 years	40%	54%
6 - 10	32	26
11 - 15	12	12
16 - 20	13	2
21 - 25	--	2
26 or more	2	4
	100%	100%
Mean number of years in present principalship	8.2	6.9

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

Table 3-28. Percentage Distribution and Mean Number of Years in All Principalships in All Systems through 1961 of Women and Men Principals

(N = 187)*

Total Years in All Principalships through 1961	Women (N=89)	Men (N=98)
1 - 5 years	24%	30%
6 - 10	26	26
11 - 15	20	21
16 - 20	19	9
21 - 25	5	8
26 or more	6	6
	100%	100%
Mean number of years in all principalships through 1961	11.9	11.0

* Data unavailable for two of the 189 principals.

for both men and women are (1) teaching only, and (2) teaching and in-school administration. In general, the men and women principals had similar types and amounts of in-school and system-wide administrative experience. They differed primarily in the length of the teaching phase of their careers: the women were teachers much longer than the men. Consequently there was a much longer interval between the first teaching post and the first principalship of the women than of the men.

Notes and References for Chapter Three

1. For a discussion of the differential importance of careers to men and women in our society, Talcott Parsons, "Age and Sex in the Social Structure of the United States," in Essays in Sociological Theory (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 89-103; and Talcott Parsons, et al., Family, Socialization and Interaction Process (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1955), Chapter I, especially pp. 12-15. Concerning probable differences between men and women in the prestige of teaching as a profession, see C. C. North and Paul K. Hatt, "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," in Reinhard Bendix and Seymour M. Lipset (Eds.), Class, Status and Power (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1953), pp. 411-425; and Lucille Baudler and D. G. Paterson, "The Social Status of Women's Occupations," Occupations, XXVI (1948).
2. Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1954), pp. 238-246.
3. Natalie Rogoff, "The Decision to Study Medicine," in Robert K. Merton, et al., The Student-Physician (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 120.
4. Of the 54 per cent of the men whose preferred occupation was not teaching, their first choices were engineering (4 per cent), chemistry, physics, or related areas (2 per cent), medicine (21 per cent), law (10 per cent), journalism (4 per cent), business (6 per cent), scholarly work (4 per cent), and miscellaneous occupations (3 per cent). Of the 20 per cent of the women whose first choice of an occupation was not teaching, the preferred occupations were chemistry, physics, or

related areas (1 per cent), medicine (1 per cent), law (5 per cent), nursing (2 per cent), business (3 per cent), scholarly work (1 per cent), and miscellaneous occupations (7 per cent).

5. It is interesting to note that if we had used the 10, rather than five, per cent level of statistical significance, we would have concluded that there was a significant difference between the two groups in favor of the late deciders.

6. Wagner Thielens, Jr., "Some Comparisons of Entrants to Medical and Law School," in Merton, et al., op. cit., p. 136.

7. Ibid.

8. Talcott Parsons, "Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child," in Parsons, et al., op. cit., pp. 35-131.

9. For a more detailed discussion of the effect of entrance requirement on the timing of career decisions, see Thielens, op. cit., pp. 139-143.

10. Mason, et al., in their study of beginning public school classroom teachers, found that 51 per cent of the men beginning teachers, but only nine per cent of the women, expected to ". . .continue in the field of education until retirement, but. . .move from classroom teaching into some other area of education [mostly administrative and supervisory positions] eventually." See Ward S. Mason, et al., "Sex Role and the Career Orientations of Beginning Teachers," Harvard Educational Review, XXIX (1959), p. 374.

11. Caplow, op. cit., pp. 238-246.

12. Margaret Cussler, The Woman Executive (New York: Harcourt, Brace & Co., 1958), pp. 17-26.

13. In the study conducted by the Department of Elementary School Principals of the National Education Association, the median years of experience as a classroom teacher was 17.6 for women supervising principals of elementary schools and 7.0 for men, indicating the same tendency for women principals to have had more teaching experience than men. See "The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study," Thirty-seventh Yearbook, The National Elementary Principal, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association (1958), p. 113.

Chapter 4: Occupational Aspirations

The organizational charts displayed in the central administrative offices of most school systems, like those in other large-scale enterprises, serve at least two purposes: the most obvious one is to outline the division of labor and the structure of authority. The small square boxes with their connecting lines delineate formally who is responsible to whom and who is supposed to do what. A second and less often recognized function is to display routes of mobility for those who aspire to climb the organizational hierarchy.

Nearly all of the men and women principals in our sample had already moved up one or more steps in the hierarchy of status in school systems during their professional careers. Fifty-five per cent, as we noted in the previous chapter, had gone directly from classroom teaching to the principalship. The sequence of career of the remainder consisted primarily of moving from the position of teacher to a minor administrative post, such as assistant or vice-principal, and then to a principalship. Like lower-level administrators in other organizations, the principals varied in the extent of their further professional ambitions. Some aspired to top administrative posts in the school system, for example, a superintendent, deputy or assistant superintendent. Principals with less ambitions or somewhat different aspirations hoped to achieve other system-wide administrative jobs, such as director of curriculum or guidance.

The organizational chart, however, does not depict all the ways in which principals can obtain increased prestige and greater rewards in their careers. Another way is intra-occupational mobility, i.e., a

principalship in their own or another school system at the same or a different level which commands greater income, responsibility, or prestige. Still another is to secure the formal or informal recognition of colleagues, for example, by achieving an outstanding professional reputation or by being elected to office in a state or national educational association. A third possibility is to leave public school administration for college teaching: many professors of education are former school principals. We should not overlook, too, the possibility that many may already have largely satisfied their occupational ambition on achieving the elementary principalship.

In this chapter we inquire whether men and women principals differ in the aspiration to positions of greater authority in and out of school systems, as well as to greater prestige in the educational world.

The Hypothesis

Women principals are "career women," atypical in that they have attained positions at the executive level in a society in which men usually command such posts. With a sequence of career more similar to that of men than women, their attitudes towards work and career, specifically to occupational advancement, may approximate those of men also. Rosenberg's finding about the occupational values of career-oriented male and female college students suggests the possibility: he found that the two groups were almost identical in their interest in securing "a good deal of money," and "status and prestige" from their profession.¹ As a consequence of their minority status in the occupational world, career women may, on the average, aspire to higher occupational advancement

than men. The other arguments we explored, however, led to the opposite conclusion: that the level of aspiration of men principals tends to be higher than that of the women. This hypothesis, which is to be tested, is based on four lines of reasoning:

The first is the assumption that two individuals who have attained the same position in a status hierarchy do not necessarily gauge their achievement in the same way. Empirical and theoretical work in psychology and sociology has demonstrated that people frequently hold varying ideas of the same event or happening because they apply different reference groups or standards in evaluating them, a phenomenon for which Stouffer coined the terms, relative deprivation and relative gratification. He used the concept of relative deprivation to account for a number of unanticipated findings in The American Soldier. One of his military illustrations is directly relevant to our problem:

. . . relative rate of advancement can be based on different standards by different classes of the Army population. For example, a grade school man who became a corporal after a year of service would have had a more rapid rate of promotion compared with most of his friends at the same educational level than would a college man who rose to this same grade in a year. Hence we would expect, at a given rank and a given longevity, that the better educated would be more likely than others to complain of the slowness of promotion.²

What do the concepts of relative gratification and relative deprivation imply for a hypothesis relating sex to aspiration? If we assume

that the reference group of women principals for evaluating their achievement in the matter of status is the cohort of women college graduates in their age group in the occupational world and that the reference group of men is male college graduates of comparable age in the labor force, it seems reasonable to expect that women principals will have a much higher evaluation of their occupational achievement than men. In both relative and absolute terms, the number of executives of the same sex whose income and prestige is greater than that of a principal's is considerably larger among the men than the women. Although the objective status and the achieved mobility of men and women principals are the same, their evaluation of their relative achievement would be different. If we assume further that in a group of individuals who occupy the same position, those who assess their ascent as relatively high will feel less need to strive for even higher status than those who assess theirs as relatively low, it follows then that women in the principalship would have a lower level of aspiration than men.

Our second line of reasoning was based on the idea that incumbents of the same position vary in their notion of their relative chances for advancement because of personal characteristics or organizational practices. Two relevant circumstances in school systems, and other organizations as well, are the individual's age and the sex ratio among higher administrators. In any work organization, older members will have a shorter period prior to retirement than younger ones in which to attain higher positions. We assume that the amount of time in which a person has the opportunity to be mobile is positively related to his aspiration.

Other things being equal, then, of two individuals occupying the same position, the younger's aspiration will tend to be higher than the older's. Knowing that women principals are older, on the average, than men (an assumption which was validated as shown in Chapter Two), we expect the former to aspire lower than the latter. In addition, opportunities for advancement to higher administrative positions in large city school systems are unquestionably much greater for men than for women. Although approximately four out of 10 elementary principals are women, this relatively balanced sex distribution for women decreases steadily at higher levels of the public school hierarchy. Thus, no woman is superintendent of a large city school system, and in nearly all of them the great majority of secondary-school principals and higher administrators are men. If we assume that women principals in the elementary school take this fact into account in planning their careers, it also would lead to their having lower occupational aspirations.

The differences in marital status between men and women principals is the third major reason we expected differences in aspirations for their careers. We reported (Chapter Two) striking differences between them in this respect: over nine out of 10 of the men are married but almost two-thirds of the women principals are single. How would this sex difference influence aspiration? Since the great majority of men principals are married and the majority of women single, the former are much more likely to be subjected to overt and covert demands for upward mobility because of family pressure. A man's occupational status typically

determines his level of income and defines his family's social standing in the community. The work of married women principals, however, is often a second source of family income, subordinate to their husbands' as a determinant of the family's social status. These assumptions, too, lead directly to the hypothesis that men in the principalship will aspire higher occupationally than women.

One further idea is relevant to the hypothesis: in American society more pressure is exerted on men to achieve occupational success than on women. Success in another sphere, the family and the home, is stressed for women. The greater pressure on men is a consequence of the prominence of the occupational role as part of the expectations of the role of the male, in general, in our society. These varying expectations lead us to anticipate that men will feel a greater desire for occupational advancement than women.

Testing the Hypothesis

The principals' responses to a Level of Aspiration Instrument provided the data required to test the hypothesis. The instrument was designed to include a variety of ways in which principals can be occupationally mobile or gain professional recognition during their careers, for example, by promotion to a higher administrative position or to another principalship, one with greater responsibility, prestige, or income. (See Table 4-5 for the types of questions used.) In answering the questions, the administrators were asked to indicate which of five categories of response best reflected their feelings:

I would not want to. . . .

I am not especially anxious to. . . .

I have some desire to. . . .

I would very much like to. . . .

I am extremely anxious to. . . .

A six-item Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .920 was developed from the principals' responses to the instrument to measure their level of aspiration.³ When the mean scores of the men and women principals on this index of level of aspiration were compared, the hypothesis turned out to be supported: the men had a higher mean scale score than the women (3.30 vs. 2.03), and the difference of 1.27 is statistically significant at below the .001 level (Table 4-1).

What about the possibility that the differences between the level of aspiration of men and of women principals may simply represent the influence of a confounding third variable on the primary relationship? In this connection, we considered two variables that could lead us to make a spurious interpretation of the relationship: academic ability and the principal's self-evaluation of his professional performance. The case could be made that principals who are the most academically able or who assess their own professional competence most highly will aspire higher than those who are their inferiors in these respects. If either of these variables is positively related to level of aspiration, and men are also characterized by higher academic achievement or self-assessment than women, then one or both of them may explain away the finding.

However, it readily became apparent that neither of these variables could be viewed as a confounding factor. In each instance, the pattern

Table 4-1. Mean, Frequency and Percentage Distributions of Women and Men Principals on the Level of Aspiration Scale

Level of Aspiration Scale Score	Women		Men	
	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent
6	4	4	8	9
5	5	6	11	11
4	5	6	32	33
3	8	9	15	15
2	35	39	20	20
1	20	22	7	7
0	13	14	5	5
	90	100	99	100
Mean Scale Score	2.03		3.30	

$t = 5.61, p < .001.$

of relationship between sex and the variables was directly opposite to what would have been required if they were producing spurious relationships. For example, if academic ability were operating to create a spurious relationship, then men principals would have had to demonstrate greater academic ability than women principals. But in Chapter Two, we presented findings showing that women principals, on the whole, had received higher grades in their academic work in high school and college than had the men. And in a later chapter we shall show that the relationship between sex and self-evaluation is also opposite to that required if it were to account for the relationship between sex and aspiration.

Two other factors deserve mention: age and marital status. Since we have used these variables as possible intervening links in developing the theoretical rationale for the hypothesis concerning aspiration, it is not appropriate to view them as confounding variables. We shall examine later their explanatory value.

To examine the degree of internal replication in our data, that is, the extent to which the original finding holds up under various subgroupings of the data, we classified the men and women principals in four ways: by region, size of city, size of school, and by socio-economic status of the student body. This revealed that in all regions, in all size cities, in all size schools, and in schools with pupils varying in socio-economic status, the women's aspirations are lower than the men's (Table 4-2). The persistence of these sex differences under various sub-classifications of the data further increased our

Table 4-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Level of Aspiration by Four Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	2.46	1.78	13	3.15	1.71	20	+
Midwest	2.20	1.44	25	2.80	1.28	30	+
East	1.88	1.57	33	3.89	1.55	19	+
South	1.79	1.24	19	3.52	1.48	29	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	1.73	1.36	45	3.12	1.45	49	+
Medium	1.94	1.46	33	3.20	1.68	30	+
Large	3.42	1.55	12	3.89	1.37	19	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	2.18	1.59	33	3.53	1.45	30	+
Medium	1.76	1.19	37	2.70	1.61	27	+
Large	2.30	1.85	20	3.51	1.45	41	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	2.14	1.41	28	3.31	1.55	35	+
Medium	1.74	1.62	27	3.34	1.49	35	+
High	2.17	1.50	35	3.21	1.59	28	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

confidence in the findings obtained on the total sample.

The analysis (Table 4-2) reveals a number of interesting incidental findings. We shall mention four of them: (1) When the data are sub-classified by region, the greatest differences in the scores as between men and women principals occur in the East and the South, and the least in the Midwest and the West; (2) the men in the East show the highest level of aspiration and the men in the Midwest, the lowest; (3) when the scores of the men and women principals are compared by size of city, the smallest differences are found to exist in the largest cities (1,000,000 and more population) and the greatest in the smallest cities (50,000 and under population); (4) among both the men and women, those who hold principalships in the largest cities have considerably higher scores than elementary school administrators in smaller communities.

Test of the Reasoning

Now we propose to examine whether the assumptions underlying the hypothesis on level of aspiration received empirical support. We reasoned that four intervening variables link sex to aspiration: differential evaluation of occupational achievement, awareness of relative chances for advancement, marital status, and differential pressure toward occupational success.

Briefly stated, the reasoning was as follows: (1) If men and women in the same occupational position evaluate their relative achievement differently because of the comparative standards they apply and if women principals view their positions as conferring on them relatively greater status than do men principals, then women will entertain lower aspirations

than men. (2) If women principals believe that, being older, their chances of further occupational mobility are less than men principals' and if age is negatively related to aspiration, then women principals would reveal a lower level of aspiration than men principals. (3) If married men feel greater pressure toward occupational mobility than women, single or married, and if most men principals are married, the latter should tend to aspire higher than women. (4) If men in American society are exposed to greater pressure toward occupational success than women, then men principals should aspire higher than women.

In testing this reasoning, the first step is to determine if each of the intervening variables is in fact related to both the independent variable (sex) and the dependent one (level of aspiration) in the assumed manner. If these connections do not exist, then, of course, the basic assumptions on which the hypothesis is based are not tenable. If the evidence does support them, we can proceed to the next step.

The data required to test the relationships between the intervening and the independent and dependent variables specified by our reasoning are presented in Table 4-3. With regard to age and marital status (the table indicates this in terms of point-biserial correlation coefficients), two findings appeared which were reported earlier: that women principals are older on the average than the men and that the men in the principalship are much more frequently married than the women. Marital status and age are shown as associated with aspiration, as we assumed: the older a principal, the lower his aspiration, and the unmarried tend to aspire lower than the married. Both relationships

Table 4-3. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Level of Aspiration)

(N = 188)

Assumed Intervening Variable	Sex [#] (Point-biserial r)	Level of Aspiration (Pearsonian r)
Evaluation of relative achievement	-.09	.21*
Age	.31*	-.34*
Marital status	-.66*	.34*
Pressure for occupational success	-.12*	.43*

Female = 1; male = 0.

* $p < .05$.

required for "pressure toward occupational success" to be considered an intervening variable exist, but only one of the necessary relationships is found to justify "evaluation of relative achievement":⁴ the former is related to sex and aspiration in the manner assumed, but the latter is associated with level of aspiration only, not with sex, at below the .05 level of statistical significance.

Now we can take the next step in examining whether three of the four posited intervening variables may account in part for the relationship between sex and aspiration. The logic of our procedure, presented in Chapter One, is as follows: if an intervening variable is at work, then, when it is held constant, the size of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables should diminish. If the relationship remains the same, then the explanatory variable being held constant could not account at all for the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, since it has no effect on it. The procedure we shall follow is to examine first the zero-order relationship between sex and aspiration, and then the first-order partial relationship between these two variables, holding constant first, age, next, marital status and then pressure toward occupational success. Finally, we present higher-order partial correlation coefficients in which combinations of these variables will be held constant simultaneously.

The zero-order correlation (point-biserial) between sex and aspiration and the first-order partial correlations between these variables, when each of the three possible intervening variables is held constant,

are shown in Table 4-4. The zero-order correlation between sex and level of aspiration is $-.38$. When age is held constant the relationship between sex and level of aspiration drops to $-.31$. When marital status is held constant, the relationship decreases to $-.23$. It drops only from $-.38$ to $-.37$, when pressure toward occupational success is held constant. In short, only two of the possible "explanatory" variables, age and marital status, appear to have some bearing on the relationships between the independent and dependent variables. The third one, pressure toward occupational success, has hardly any. These findings indicate that age and marital status may be operating as explanatory variables. To explore this question further, we turn to the results after holding age and marital status constant simultaneously. Does the relationship between sex and aspiration further diminish? Table 4-4 reveals that this is, indeed, what happens: the relationship between sex and level of aspiration drops to $-.18$. We conclude that part of the reasoning underlying our hypothesis receives empirical support, but that part of it does not, since only two of the four intervening variables, age and marital status, met all the conditions required for attributing explanatory power to them.

To summarize: there is empirical justification for two of the assumptions underlying the hypothesis of level of aspiration. Age and marital status appear to be linked to both the independent and dependent variables as posited. Further, when they are held constant singly and in combination the magnitude of the relationship between sex and aspiration decreases. The other two assumed intervening variables,

Table 4-4. Zero-order, First-order and Higher-order Partial Correlations of Sex and Level of Aspiration

(N=188)

	Zero-order $\underline{r}$	First-order Partial $\underline{r}$	Higher-order Partial $\underline{r}$
Sex and Level of Aspiration	-.38		
<u>Holding constant:</u>			
Age		-.31	
Marital status (marriedness)		-.23	
Pressure for occupational success		-.37	
Age and marital status			-.18
Age, marital status, and pressure for occupational success			-.18

pressure toward occupational success and evaluation of relative achievement, do not fully meet the specifications required if they are to be viewed as explanatory. Perhaps one reason is that both are so closely linked to age and marital status that they do not make an independent contribution to the analysis.

Further Analyses

Additional light on sex differences in occupational mobility among elementary school administrators may be obtained by examining their responses to questions included in the Level of Aspiration Instrument (Table 4-5):

Of the five questions pertaining to vertical mobility within school systems, two were rather general in nature: "How desirous are you to obtain a higher administrative position in your present school system?" and "How desirous are you to obtain a higher administrative position in another school system?" When we cross-classified the responses to the first question by sex, we found that more than twice the proportion of women as of men principals (34 per cent vs. 13 per cent) indicated no desire to ascend the hierarchy in their own school system. Conversely, over twice as many men as women expressed definite interest in achieving a higher administrative position in it (Item 1, Table 4-5). The responses of both men and women to the second question, that on aspiring to administrative positions in school systems other than their own (Item 2), revealed the same basic pattern: men much more frequently expressed a desire for administrative advancement than women principals (23 per cent vs. 7 per cent). A comparison of the

Table 4-5. Percentage Distribution of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the 13 Items on Level of Aspiration

		Per Cent of Principals Responding			
Item		Would Not Want to	Not Especially Anxious to	Have Definite Desire to [#]	(N)
How desirous are you to:					
1. Obtain a higher adminis- trative position in my present school system.*	W M	34% 13	41% 28	25% 59	91 98
2. Obtain a higher adminis- trative position in some other school system.*	W M	69 44	24 33	7 23	90 98
3. Become an assistant or deputy superintendent of schools in a large city system.*	W M	81 38	12 36	7 26	91 98
4. Become the school super- intendent of a large city system.	W M	90 61	9 26	1 13	91 98
5. Become the school super- intendent of a small school system.	W M	89 61	9 27	1 12	91 98
6. Obtain a principalship that has greater responsibilities than my present position.	W M	42 19	43 39	15 42	91 98
7. Obtain a principalship that would carry more prestige than my present position.*	W M	39 17	43 50	18 33	91 98
8. Obtain a principalship which would pay more money than my present position.*	W M	18 9	52 32	30 59	91 98

[#] Includes the following three response categories: "have some desire to," "would very much like to," and "am extremely anxious to."

* Item included in Level of Aspiration Scale.

Table 4-5. (Cont.)

		Per Cent of Principals Responding			
Item		Would Not Want to	Not Especially Anxious to	Have Definite Desire to [#]	(N)
How desirous are you to:					
9. Establish an outstanding reputation among my professional colleagues.	W	12%	36%	52%	91
	M	8	21	71	98
10. Take a more important role in professional educational organizations.*	W	26	35	39	91
	M	16	29	55	98
11. Some day be president of a state association of principals.	W	58	36	6	91
	M	41	38	21	98
12. Some day be president of a national association of principals.	W	77	21	2	90
	M	55	33	12	97
13. Become a college professor of education.	W	65	15	20	90
	M	40	22	38	98

[#] Includes the following three response categories: "have some desire to," "would very much like to," and "am extremely anxious to."

* Item included in Level of Aspiration Scale.

principals' responses to Items 1 and 2 indicated much less interest on the part of both men and women in moving into the higher echelons of school systems other than their own. This finding probably reflected such matters as seniority and pension rights, familiarity with the formal and informal systems, and identification with the local community.

What did the data indicate about the interest of men and women principals in specific top positions in administration such as superintendent, deputy or assistant superintendent of a school system? They showed that the proportion of both men and women principals who aspired to them (Items 3, 4, 5) was much smaller than the proportion of those who indicated a desire for higher administrative positions "in general" (Items 1, 2). However, the proportion of women principals displaying an interest in them was, again, considerably less than that of men principals: four out of five women in comparison to two out of every five men expressed no interest in becoming assistant or deputy superintendents in a large city school system. And nine out of 10 women, in comparison to six out of 10 men, rejected the idea of a school superintendency in either a large or small school system. The sex differences in the responses to these questions apparently reflected, in part, a realistic assessment of the possibilities of their occupational advancement: for women, there are few opportunities to become high-level school administrators. The men's replies bespoke a measure of realism: twice as many of them evinced interest in the assistant superintendency as in the superintendency; the former is the next step up after the principalship in most school systems and usually a prerequisite to a superintendency.

We pointed out earlier that the responsibilities, prestige, and salaries associated with the principalship vary: for example, a high-school principalship is typically viewed as entailing greater responsibility and conferring more prestige than an elementary one; high-school principals generally receive larger salaries than principals in junior-high schools, who, in turn, usually receive more remuneration than administrators in the elementary school. Moreover, in certain schools which are recognized as the show pieces of the local system to be the principal confers particular prestige. And in a number of systems the principal's salary is determined by the number of pupils or teachers in his school.

In responding to three questions focused on their interest in upward mobility, the men expressed higher aspirations than women in each instance (Items 6, 7, 8). Two other interesting findings emerged from the responses: first, both men and women exhibited much greater interest in a principalship with a higher salary than one with greater responsibility or prestige; second, a greater proportion of the men preferred positions with more responsibility while a slightly greater percentage of women said they would choose positions with increased prestige.

To discover if there were sex differences in the principals' desire for recognition from their professional colleagues, we asked them four questions about their desire (1) to establish an outstanding professional reputation among their colleagues, (2) to take a more active role in professional educational associations, (3) to be president of a state association of principals, and (4) to serve as president of a

national association of principals. The men evinced a greater interest in all four forms of professional recognition than the women. It is interesting to note, however, that sex differences in response to these questions were not as great as in the responses to questions we discussed earlier.

Outside of school systems, a principal may aspire to become professor of education in an institution of higher learning: many faculty members in schools of education, as already remarked, have at one time been principals of elementary or secondary schools. Is there also a sex difference in this? The data indicated that there is: 65 per cent of the women in contrast to 40 per cent of the men indicated no desire for this type of position.

To sum up: the men principals expressed item by item in the Level of Aspiration Instrument a greater desire for occupational mobility and for prestige than the women. The largest differences between the two occurred in their desire for a higher administrative position in their own school system, for a principalship entailing a larger income or one bringing greater responsibility. Their levels of aspiration were most similar in areas in which principals in general expressed the least interest: in their desire to become president of a national association of principals, or superintendent of schools in a small or large school system.

Notes and References for Chapter Four

1. Morris Rosenberg, Occupations and Values (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1957), p. 50.
2. Samuel A. Stouffer, et al., The American Soldier: Adjustment During Army Life, Volume 1 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1949), p. 250.
3. See Appendix C, Table C-1 for the technical details of the construction of the Level of Aspiration Scale.
4. Evaluation of relative achievement was measured by the responses of the principals to a question about the amount of progress they had made in their professional careers. The response categories and the weights assigned to them were as follows: (1) very satisfied, (2) moderately satisfied, (3) slightly satisfied, (4) slightly dissatisfied, (5) moderately dissatisfied, (6) very dissatisfied.

Chapter 5: Educational Values

Much work in the social sciences is based on the premise that the values or ideal standards that individuals use to evaluate persons or objects offer important clues to understanding their social behavior. The school principals' conceptions of a "good school" and a "good teacher" may partly account for how they vary in their performance as the formal leaders of their schools. Their efforts, for instance, to improve the work of their teachers and, indeed, whether they make any effort in that direction at all are undoubtedly determined by the standards and values on which they make their judgments. Their standards also may determine whether the teachers take into account individual differences among pupils in their classroom work.

Such considerations sparked our interest in investigating how the basic educational beliefs of men and women principals vary and how differences in them could affect their own behavior and that of their subordinates. Several of the hypotheses about sex differences in performance to be tested in later chapters are based on our assumptions about differences in the educational values of the men and women in the principalship. Now we shall inquire whether our empirical evidence offers any support for them.

Criteria for Evaluation of Schools

The differences in effectiveness of institutions of lower or higher learning are hard to assess because for one thing the influence of schools on students cannot be fully and fairly gauged until many years after they leave them. A second impediment is that the objectives of

educational institutions of the same general type may vary and this raises the difficult problem of selecting legitimate criteria for their evaluation. For example, some elementary schools give great weight to the social and physical development of their pupils while others ignore it. To use the same criteria where schools vary as to goals is not a logical procedure. A third difficulty is that since the human resources with which schools have to work can vary considerably, it is also questionable to evaluate them without taking into account the capabilities or motivation of their students. A fourth is that we have no precise procedures to measure certain qualities of students, for example, their creativity.¹ Yet in actuality, the heads of educational institutions do have criteria they use to assess the effectiveness of their institutions. For this reason we raised the question, "Do women and men in the elementary principalship apply the same standards in the evaluation of their schools?"

The strategy we used to obtain data bearing on this question was as follows: during the interviews the principals were asked to state the criteria they would use if appointed to a committee to evaluate a school such as their own. Next, the interviewers asked them to assume that others of the committee also had prepared lists of evaluative standards. The principals were then asked, of each of 25 supposed criteria: "How much importance do you believe this criterion should be given?" The response categories gave them the choice between: "great," "some," "little," and "no importance."

The items on the list were chosen as to reflect various standards

including the following four on which we had predicted differences by sex: the school's concern with individual differences, the academic performance of its pupils, the proportion of pupils who seem delinquency-prone, and the school's ability to influence the social and emotional development of the child. When the administrators' responses to the 25 criteria were factor-analyzed, four of the five factors that emerged did appear to reflect the criteria; the fifth may be described as the school's ability to maintain discipline among pupils. Five separate scores of the importance each principal assigned to the criteria were then computed, each of which was calculated from the weights derived from the loadings of items included in the individual factors. These summary measures will be used in the test of our predictions about the differences between the weights assigned by the men and by the women principals.

Differences between Individual Pupils

Our first prediction was that women principals would give greater weight than men to the degree to which a school took into account the individual differences between pupils. We based it on the assumption that the women had more interest in and knowledge about pedagogical techniques than men; and since the professional literature on teaching insists on recognition of the varying aptitudes and abilities of pupils, we reasoned that women would give this point greater weight than the men would.

The items in the criterion, Concern with Differences between Individual Pupils are:

- (1) The degree to which special provisions are made for the "slow learner."
- (2) The degree to which special provisions are made for the "gifted child."
- (3) The degree to which teaching materials in addition to textbooks are being used.
- (4) The degree to which students work up to their capacities.²

The mean scores of the men and women principals support the prediction: the women obtained a higher average score than the men (10.10 vs. 9.91) and the difference of 0.19 between them is statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 5-1).

This difference by sex is remarkably consistent in nearly all the sub-groupings we examined (Table 5-2). In all regions and in all schools regardless of size, women give greater weight to the differences between individual pupils than do men. When we compare the mean scores of principals whose pupils differ in socio-economic origin, we again find that the women consistently obtain higher scores than the men. And the same findings emerge when we sort by age of the principals or their marital status. Of our 18 sub-comparisons, 17 were in the predicted direction, the one exception being in comparisons made in cities of 1,000,000 or more where the scores of the men and women were approximately the same. We conclude, then, that women in assessing the "goodness" of a school pay more attention than men to its regard for individual differences among pupils.

Table 5-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern with Differences Between Individual Pupils

(N = 185)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.10	0.61	87
Men	9.91	0.82	98

* Data unavailable for four of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.83$; $p < .05$.

Table 5-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern with Differences Between Individual Pupils by Six Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	9.83	0.73	13	9.58	0.81	20	+
Midwest	10.21	0.46	24	9.98	0.79	30	+
East	10.08	0.70	32	10.00	0.88	19	+
South	10.21	0.43	18	9.99	0.74	29	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.14	0.52	43	9.91	0.86	49	+
Medium	10.05	0.76	32	9.77	0.82	30	+
Large	10.11	0.47	12	10.12	0.62	19	-
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	10.04	0.68	33	9.98	0.63	30	+
Medium	10.11	0.53	35	10.04	0.88	27	+
Large	10.20	0.62	19	9.77	0.87	41	+

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 5-2. (Cont.)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.23	0.50	28	9.97	0.76	35	+
Middle	10.02	0.79	26	9.84	0.85	35	+
High	10.06	0.52	33	9.92	0.83	28	+
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	10.13	0.57	11	9.96	0.74	37	+
Middle	10.07	0.48	36	9.82	0.90	32	+
Old	10.13	0.72	40	9.93	0.79	29	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	10.21	0.52	23	9.93	0.82	90	+
Single	10.07	0.63	55	9.45	0.71	5	+
Other	--	--	9	--	--	3	*

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

Academic Performance of Pupils

The second prediction we made was that men and women principals would not differ in the importance they attribute to the academic performance of pupils as a basis for judging a school. As we assumed this was a generally accepted standard among principals, we did not anticipate a sex difference in the entire sample.

The index we used was based on the factor weights of the four following items:

- (1) The success of former students in whatever educational institution they go to next.
- (2) The proportion of students who eventually go on to college.
- (3) The degree of student mastery of subject matter fundamentals.
- (4) The achievement test scores of students.

The findings (Table 5-3) reveal, as predicted, no sex difference in the weight assigned: although the men had a slightly lower mean score than the women (10.16 vs. 10.27), the difference is not statistically significant at below the .05 level (a low score represents a high evaluation of performance).

It will be recalled, however, that the principals were asked about schools "similar to their own." Although in the total sample sex made no difference in the weight given to the pupils' performance, it is possible for men and women to differ in this respect under certain conditions: one is the socio-economic background typical of their pupils. If, as is commonly assumed, pupils who come from families of low socio-economic status have greater difficulties in learning than those from families of higher status, then it could be maintained that the women

Table 5-3. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance
Attributed to Academic Performance of Pupils

(N = 185)*
(Low Score = High Importance)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.27	0.80	87
Men	10.16	0.72	98

* Data unavailable for four of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.04$; $p > .05$.

principals, because of their more extensive teaching experience and greater ability to cope with problem learners, might emphasize learning more than men in schools where the average socio-economic status of the pupils was relatively low.

To explore this possibility we computed the mean scores of the men and women principals in our sample who were in charge of schools in which the average socio-economic status of pupils was relatively low. We found no support for this line of reasoning since in schools of this type the men, not the women, obtained the lower scores (10.27 vs. 10.50). The difference between their scores, however, was not statistically significant at below the .05 level. We also looked at the mean scores of the men and women principals in schools whose socio-economic rating was relatively high or medium in our sample. In the schools of high socio-economic rating, the mean scores of the men and women were almost identical. In those of medium standing, the men had lower scores than the women, but the difference was not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 5-4).⁴

A second relevant condition in the principals' environment is their view of the competence of their teachers. If principals set a relatively low value on the capabilities of their staffs, then it could be argued that those with a higher opinion of their own ability to influence the classroom performance of their teachers would attribute greater importance to this standard. If we assume that women judge their capability for supervising instruction more favorably than men,⁵ then among principals with weak staffs, we would expect the women to

**Table 5-4. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance
Attributed to Academic Performance of Pupils by
Two Specified Subclassifications
(Low Score = High Importance)**

Subclassification [*]	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Proba- bility Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>						
Low	10.50	28	10.27	35	1.40	n.s.
Middle	10.51	26	10.26	35	1.25	n.s.
High	9.90	33	9.89	28	0.02	n.s.
<u>Competence of Staff</u>						
Low	10.62	23	10.26	27	1.68	n.s.
Medium	10.25	30	10.23	36	0.07	n.s.
High	10.01	32	10.00	35	0.02	n.s.

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

stress it more than the men. For this supposition is there empirical support?

To answer this question we sorted the principals into three groups on the basis of the proportion of their teachers who they felt carried out their tasks in a competent way and then obtained the mean factor scores on the criterion for men and women who fell into each of the three categories (Table 3-4). We found that the conditional relationship we suggested does not occur: the men tend to place greater stress on academic performance as a criterion than the women under the condition of a relatively low evaluation of teachers' competence. However, although the difference between the sexes in this sub-grouping in their mean factor scores is considerably greater than that in the entire sample (10.26 vs. 10.62), it is not statistically significant at below the .05 level, using a two-tailed test.⁶ We conclude, then, that the evidence does not support our supposition. One other point deserves note: among the principals who assess their staffs more favorably, the factor scores of the women and men on the criterion of academic performance were highly similar (Table 3-4).

Delinquency-prone Pupils

Our third prediction about differences between the sexes in the criteria by which they evaluate schools was that women place more emphasis on the presence of delinquency-prone pupils in them. We predicted a difference according to sex on the assumption that women are more concerned about the socio-emotional development of pupils and their conformity to middle-class standards than men.⁷

To test this prediction we used a third factor score obtained from the principals' responses to the 25 criteria, one which included the following items:

- (1) The proportion of students engaging in vandalism.
- (2) The proportion of students who are constant discipline problems.
- (3) The amount of student truancy.
- (4) The proportion of students who cheat.
- (5) The drop-out rate in the school.⁸

The findings supported the prediction: women on the average obtained factor scores indicating greater emphasis on proneness to delinquency: the mean factor score for women was 9.88 and for men 10.13 (a low factor score equals high evaluation of the criterion), and the difference of 0.25 between the mean scores is statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 5-5).

Does this difference by sex among principals persist regardless of the socio-economic composition of their student body? The answer is yes, because when the principals are sub-classified into three groups by this characteristic of their schools, in each case the finding in the total sample is corroborated (Table 5-6). Similar conclusions are reached when we sort the data by the principals' evaluation of the competence of their staffs and the principals' marital status and age. The findings also are consistent in three of the four regions, the one exception being the West. Another exception occurred in medium sized cities: in this instance, too, men reached somewhat higher scores on this

Table 5-5. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Presence of Delinquency-prone Pupils in the School

(N = 185)*
(Low Score = High Emphasis)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.88	0.77	87
Men	10.13	0.84	98

* Data unavailable for four of the 189 principals.

$t = 2.07$; $p < .05$.

Table 5-6. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Presence of Delinquency-prone Pupils in the School by Six Specified Subclassifications

(Low Score = High Emphasis)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	10.06	0.65	13	9.79	0.82	20	-
Midwest	9.84	0.71	24	10.29	0.84	30	+
East	9.96	0.85	32	10.39	0.76	19	+
South	9.69	0.76	18	10.04	0.81	29	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	9.75	0.80	43	10.28	0.84	49	+
Medium	9.97	0.68	32	9.84	0.81	30	-
Large	10.14	0.81	12	10.22	0.78	19	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	9.72	0.66	28	9.99	0.60	35	+
Middle	10.08	0.69	26	10.09	0.88	35	+
High	9.87	0.88	33	10.37	0.98	28	+

[‡] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 5-6. (Cont.)

Subclassification [‡]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	10.05	0.75	23	10.13	0.72	27	+
Medium	9.76	0.62	30	10.13	0.74	36	+
High	9.95	0.88	32	10.13	1.01	35	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	9.65	0.62	23	10.13	0.84	90	+
Single	9.94	0.81	55	10.24	0.93	5	+
Other	--	--	9	--	--	3	*
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	9.77	0.58	11	10.09	0.77	37	+
Middle	9.92	0.82	36	9.96	0.77	32	+
Old	9.709	0.718	40	10.38	0.94	29	+

‡ See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

basis of assessment than women (Table 5-6). In view of the sex difference found in the total sample and the high degree of consistency in the subsidiary findings, we conclude that women view the presence of delinquency-prone pupils as a more important criterion in assessing schools than do men.

Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child

The fourth criterion of assessing schools about which we made a prediction was their concern for the social and emotional development of pupils. The factor score we used to index this criterion contained three items:

- (1) The degree to which students exhibit emotional maturity.
- (2) The degree to which students exhibit social maturity.
- (3) The degree of tolerance toward fellow students of differing social backgrounds exhibited by students.⁹

Our prediction was that women would give to this criterion greater weight than the men, basing it on the fact that there has been considerable emphasis upon socio-emotional factors in learning in the *elementary schools for many years* and women principals, having had greater experience as teachers than the men, may be expected to appreciate this criterion the more.

The mean factor scores of the men and women principals support the prediction: women do give greater weight than men to concern for the social and emotional development of their pupils. The mean score of the women was 10.27 and that of the men 10.05, and the difference between these scores is statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 5-7).

Table 5-7. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child

(N = 185)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.27	0.72	87
Men	10.05	0.89	98

* Data unavailable for four of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.84$; $p < .05$.

This difference, like others we have found in the entire sample, persists in nearly all the sub-classifications we analyzed (Table 5-8): when we sort the principals by size of their cities and their schools, by age and marital status, and by their judgment of the competence of their staffs. And the difference between sexes also occurs in three of the four regions and two of the three categories of socio-economic status. In 19 of the 21 sub-classifications of the data, the women's factor scores reflected greater emphasis on social and emotional development as a criterion than the men's: and in the two exceptions--the East and the schools high in socio-economic status--the differences in factor scores were quite small. We conclude, then, women place greater stress on a school's concern for the child's social and emotional development as a basis of evaluation than men.

Discipline of Pupils

Do women, when they evaluate schools, also tend to place greater emphasis than men on the school's ability to maintain discipline? The "extra dividend" factor that emerged from the factor analysis of the 25 criteria allows us to explore this question. We shall designate it as the school's Ability to Maintain Pupil Discipline, and it contains the following items:

- (1) The degree to which teachers are able to maintain discipline in their classes.
- (2) The degree to which students have respect for the teachers.
- (3) The degree to which students exercise self-discipline.¹⁰

The men's and women's mean factor scores show that although the

Table 5-8. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child by Seven Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification [†]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.29	0.64	43	9.92	0.96	49	+
Medium	10.16	0.83	32	10.15	0.75	30	+
Large	10.48	0.62	12	10.22	0.87	19	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	10.23	0.81	33	9.97	0.82	30	+
Medium	10.24	0.70	35	9.91	0.97	27	+
Large	10.41	0.57	19	10.20	0.86	41	+
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	10.23	0.95	11	9.84	1.06	37	+
Middle	10.49	0.49	36	10.26	0.76	32	+
Old	10.09	0.87	40	10.08	0.72	29	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	10.41	0.59	23	10.06	0.92	90	+
Single	10.25	0.78	55	9.70	0.39	5	+
Other	--	--	9	--	--	3	*

[†] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

Table 5-8. (Cont.)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	10.08	0.89	23	9.92	1.13	27	+
Medium	10.23	0.70	30	9.94	0.79	36	+
High	10.50	0.52	32	10.26	0.73	35	+
<u>Region</u>							
West	10.17	0.97	13	9.97	0.70	20	+
Midwest	10.28	0.62	24	9.83	0.86	30	+
East	10.24	0.71	32	10.26	1.09	19	-
South	10.39	0.65	18	10.20	0.84	29	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.29	0.76	28	9.95	1.06	35	+
Medium	10.33	0.64	26	10.01	0.75	35	+
High	10.17	0.74	33	10.22	0.79	28	-

[‡] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

women attribute somewhat more importance to it than men, the difference is not significantly different from zero (Table 5-9).

Although elementary men and women principals in general may not give different weight to discipline as a standard for judging schools, it is possible that they may differ in this respect when they are administrators of schools in low-income areas, for maintaining discipline there may create special problems for women. To explore this possibility we sorted out the men and women principals whose pupils were of a relatively low socio-economic background and compared their scores on the factor, Ability to Maintain Pupil Discipline. We found that in the lowest socio-economic schools there was a small and not statistically significant difference between the scores of the men and women principals (Table 5-10); in the middle socio-economic schools the difference, again, between their scores was not statistically significant; but when we isolated the schools with the highest socio-economic rating we did find a statistically significant difference by sex: there the women placed greater emphasis than the men on the school's ability to maintain discipline.¹¹ We concluded, then, that although in the total sample there was not a difference by sex in the emphasis the principals give it as a criterion, in the schools high in socio-economic status women do give it greater emphasis than men.

Criteria for Evaluating Teachers

The question, "What standards should be used to judge the competence of teachers?" is a controversial one in the public schools. Part

Table 5-9. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Discipline of Pupils

(N = 185)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.04	0.62	87
Men	9.91	0.81	98

* Data unavailable for four of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.23$; $p > .05$.

Table 5-10. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Discipline of Pupils by Socio-economic Level of Student Body

Subclassification*	Women		Men		t	Proba- bility Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>						
Low	10.11	28	10.02	35	0.53	n.s.
Middle	9.81	26	9.95	35	0.75	n.s.
High	10.17	33	9.73	28	2.23	.03

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

of the controversy arises over the criteria to be used. Should they be derived only from the classroom performance of teachers or from such things as their ability to work with fellow teachers, parents, curriculum specialists, and their administrative superiors? Additional problems are created by the apparent difficulty of obtaining agreement among educators over what are the criteria of "effective teaching." How much weight should be given to the pupils' scores on standardized achievement tests? As between the teachers' knowledge of subject matter and their ability to motivate pupils, which should be given greater weight?

Our concern with this problem is limited to whether men and women in the elementary school principalship hold similar beliefs about two criteria for the evaluation of teachers. We asked them to complete a Criteria for Evaluating Teachers Instrument, specifying the weight they attribute ("very great weight," "considerable weight," "some weight," "little weight," "no weight at all") to 31 criteria for gauging how well teachers carry out their duties. Several of its items were to indicate the importance they attributed to two general dimensions for assessing teachers on which we anticipated sex differences: their teaching skills and their responsibility in meeting their obligations to the school as a whole.

When the principals' responses to the items in the Criteria for Evaluating Teachers Instrument were factor-analyzed, two of the six factors did appear to be reasonably good indicators of the two dimensions.¹² Factor scores based on weights derived from the loadings of

items in each of the separate factors were then computed and used to measure the importance the men and women principals assigned to the two general criteria.

Technical Skills of Teachers

It seems reasonable to presume that the following technical skills would have a bearing on teaching: the teachers' knowledge of subject matter, their ability to make it interesting to pupils, and the care they take in preparation.

Do women and men principals differ in attaching weight to these skills in their evaluation of teachers? We predicted that women would stress this general criterion more than men because we assumed that they have had more teaching experience themselves than their male counterparts,¹³ and therefore we supposed they would be more appreciative of these technical skills than men. The items in this criterion are:

- (1) Ability to make subject matter interesting to students.
- (2) Comprehensiveness of lesson plans.
- (3) Knowledge of subject matter.¹⁴

The mean factor scores of the men and women support the prediction: the mean score of the women was higher than that obtained by the men (10.22 vs. 9.94), and the difference of 0.28 is statistically significant at below the .01 level (Table 5-11).

The difference between men and women in their scores on our index of the importance they attribute to the technical skills of teachers is consistent in nearly all of the sub-classifications (Table 5-12). In schools ranked from high to low in socio-economic status, women

Table 3-11. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance
Attributed to the Technical Skills of Teachers

(N = 189)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.22	0.69	91
Men	9.94	0.87	98

$t = 2.37; p < .01.$

Table 5-12. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance
Attributed to the Technical Skills of Teachers
by Six Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification [†]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	10.27	0.77	13	9.92	0.86	20	+
Midwest	10.26	0.61	26	9.64	0.90	30	+
East	10.03	0.63	33	10.43	0.50	19	-
South	10.44	0.70	19	9.96	0.89	23	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.09	0.62	45	9.88	0.95	49	+
Medium	10.29	0.68	33	9.94	0.83	30	+
Large	10.49	0.80	13	10.12	0.63	19	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	10.34	0.58	33	9.93	0.83	30	+
Medium	10.06	0.62	37	9.97	0.93	27	+
Large	10.43	0.85	21	9.94	0.85	41	+

[†] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 3-12. (Cont.)

Subclassification [†]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.32	0.69	29	10.12	0.72	35	+
Middle	10.18	0.68	27	9.90	0.88	35	+
High	10.16	0.68	35	9.78	1.00	28	+
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	10.32	0.38	11	9.94	0.85	37	+
Middle	10.22	0.71	37	10.01	0.81	32	+
Old	10.19	0.72	43	9.87	0.95	29	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	10.18	0.69	25	9.93	0.87	90	+
Single	10.23	0.67	57	10.33	0.49	5	-
Other	--	--	9	--	--	3	*

[†] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No comparison made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

consistently give greater importance to this criterion than men. Similar findings emerge when we sort the data by size of city or size of school. The findings are internally replicated among principals classified by age and among those who are married. In three of our four geographical groupings the same conclusion can be drawn. The two deviations from the general pattern occurred in the Eastern region of the nation and among single principals: in these cases the men made higher scores than the women. In view of the sex difference in the total sample and in nearly all sub-groupings of the data, we conclude that women attribute greater importance than men to the teachers' technical skills as a measure of how they carry out their work.

Organizational Responsibility

Our second prediction referred to the importance principals attribute to the teachers' promptness in the submission of reports, to their arrival in their classrooms before their pupils, and to their willingness to serve on committees of the school. These things testify to the teachers' conception of their obligations to the school as a whole, in contrast to their specific classroom responsibilities. Which, men or women principals, place more stress on this criterion? We predicted that men would value it more than women because the former with their more limited teaching experience would feel less confident in judging classroom performance than in judging organizational responsibility, a matter with which they are more familiar. The items in this criterion for evaluation are:

- (1) Cooperation with school administration.

- (2) Degree of promptness in submitting reports.
- (3) Degree of promptness in getting to classes.
- (4) Loyalty to the school administration.
- (5) Dress and general appearance.
- (6) Willingness to serve on committees of the school.
- (7) Ability to maintain good relations with fellow teachers.
- (8) Ability to maintain classroom discipline.¹³

A comparison of the mean factor scores reveals a situation directly opposed to our prediction: the mean score of the women was higher than that obtained by the men (10.20 vs. 9.84; a high score means a high opinion of the criterion) and the difference of 0.36 is statistically significant at below the .01 level, using a two-tailed test (Table 5-13). This unexpected difference between the men and women in the entire sample was internally replicated in 15 out of 16 sub-classifications of the data that we examined (Table 5-14). Women received higher scores on this criterion than men when we sub-classified the sample by region, by size of city, by size of school, and by the socio-economic status of the pupils. The single exception was the youngest women and men principals, whose factor scores were highly similar. These findings lead us to conclude that contrary to our expectation, women emphasize the teachers' organizational responsibility as a criterion for evaluating their performance more strongly than do men.

Table 5-13. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance
Attributed to the Organizational
Responsibility of Teachers

(N = 189)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.20	0.80	91
Men	9.54	0.91	98

$t = 2.82; p < .01.$

Table 5-14. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance
Attributed to the Organizational Responsibility of
Teachers by Five Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	10.26	0.71	13	9.60	1.01	20	-
Midwest	10.30	0.80	26	9.77	0.89	30	-
East	10.11	0.81	33	9.84	0.80	19	-
South	10.18	0.83	19	10.09	0.87	29	-
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.12	0.78	45	9.76	0.94	49	-
Medium	10.32	0.81	33	9.90	0.87	30	-
Large	10.18	0.81	13	9.96	0.87	19	-
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	10.21	0.78	33	9.56	0.90	30	-
Medium	10.21	0.80	37	10.16	0.82	27	-
Large	10.16	0.82	21	9.85	0.91	41	-
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.13	0.80	29	9.98	0.79	35	-
Middle	10.28	0.94	27	9.99	0.88	35	-
High	10.20	0.67	35	9.49	0.98	28	-
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	9.62	0.93	11	9.65	0.98	37	+
Middle	10.18	0.74	37	9.78	0.96	32	-
Old	10.36	0.74	43	10.16	0.63	29	-

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Notes and References for Chapter Five

1. For a discussion of the concept, student creativity, and problems connected with its measurement, see the article written by David H. Russell on "Higher Mental Processes," Encyclopedia of Educational Research (Third Edition), (New York: Macmillan Company, 1960), pp. 652-663.
2. See Appendix C, Table C-3, for item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on importance assigned the criterion, Concern with Differences between Individual Pupils.
3. See Appendix C, Table C-4, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on importance assigned the criterion, Academic Performance of Pupils.
4. All statements about the probability levels under the three socio-economic level categories in Table 5-4 are based on a two-tailed test of significance.
5. Evidence supporting this assumption is presented in Chapter Six.
6. All statements about the probability levels under the three competence of staff categories are based on a two-tailed test of significance.
7. Evidence bearing on the assumption that women principals place greater stress on the socio-emotional development of pupils than men is presented in the next section of this chapter.
8. See Appendix C, Table C-5, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on importance

assigned the criterion, Proportion of Delinquency-prone Pupils in a School.

9. See Appendix C, Table C-6, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on importance assigned to the criterion, Concern for Social and Emotional Development of the Child.

10. See Appendix C, Table C-7, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on importance assigned to the criterion, Discipline of Pupils.

11. All statements about the probability levels under the three socio-economic level categories in Table 5-10 are based on a two-tailed test of significance.

12. The other four factors that emerged from the factor analysis may be designated as identification with teaching profession, interest in parent and community affairs, commitment to teaching, and display of extra effort.

13. Evidence presented in Chapter Three, Tables 3-21 and 3-22, offers empirical support for this assumption.

14. See Appendix C, Table C-8, for item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on the teacher assessment criterion, Technical Skill of Teachers.

15. See Appendix C, Table C-9, for item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on the teacher assessment criterion, Organizational Responsibility.

4

Chapter 6: Reactions to Major Responsibilities

There are many vantage points from which one may study variations in the way individuals in a given occupation view their work. One is the importance they attribute to their various tasks, another is their conception of how they perform them, and a third is the gratification they find in them. In this chapter we shall investigate from these three perspectives what influence, if any, sex has on how elementary school administrators view their jobs.

To investigate these problems we need some sociologically meaningful, yet not too complicated, way of classifying the multiple tasks of the principals. We used one that can be applied to most, although not all, the duties enumerated in manuals of school systems. It reflects their two major formally defined functions: supervision of the instructional program and management of routine administrative affairs. It also suggests a major dilemma confronting professional administrators: the amount of time and effort they should allocate to their administrative in contrast to their professional responsibilities.¹

As was the case with many of our other predictions, some examined here will constitute assumptions involved in hypotheses to be tested later about sex differences in the performance of administrators.

Importance Assigned to Major Functions

Management of the Instructional Program

In the core functions of schools, teaching and learning, teachers are, of course, more directly involved than are school administrators; but principals may become involved in and influence them in numerous

ways, for example, in suggesting new materials for curricula and techniques of teaching and in advising teachers on classroom problems. The professional literature stresses that the principal is the "instructional leader" of the school and as such should give high priority to the educational aspect of his work. Principals, however, vary in the relative importance they ascribe to it, but is the variation by sex?

Our prediction was that women would place greater stress on the importance of supervising instruction than would men, and it was based on the following reasoning: we assumed that women principals would have had greater experience as elementary teachers than men² and therefore would more highly value their own ability to oversee the instructional program of their schools.³ If it is further assumed that the way an individual evaluates his own ability on one of his central functions is positively associated with his assessment of its importance, then it follows that women would attribute greater importance to supervising instruction than would the men.

During their interviews the principals responded to an Orientation to Tasks Instrument listing 46 activities, of each of which they were asked: "How important do you view this activity in carrying out your job as principal of your school?" The response categories were: extremely important, very important, of moderate importance, of little importance, and of no importance. The items in this instrument, a number of which bore upon supervision of instruction, were designed to measure the relative salience in the principals' eyes of their various duties. Their responses were then given weights of from five to one,

intercorrelated, and then subjected to a factor analysis. One of the five factors that emerged, we designated as Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program; and the items in it were:

- (1) Working on the improvement of the curriculum.
- (2) Introducing new teaching ideas.
- (3) Counselling pupils.
- (4) Carrying on in-service training programs for teachers.
- (5) Dealing with classroom problems of teachers.
- (6) Evaluating the performance of students.
- (7) Coordinating the work of teachers.
- (8) Conferring with individual teachers.

A factor score was computed for each principal based on weights derived from the loading of the items in the factor.⁴ We shall use this summary measure in testing our prediction that women in the principalship attribute greater importance than men to the supervision of instruction.

A low score on this factor reflects a high evaluation of instructional activities and so if our prediction is to be supported the mean factor score of the women must be lower than that of the men. The mean score of the women was, indeed, lower than that obtained by the men (9.75 vs. 9.90) but the difference of 0.15 units between them is not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 6-1). A t of 1.60 is obtained but a t of 1.65 is necessary to claim statistical significance at below this level.

The fact that the sex difference on this factor was so close to the .05 level of significance suggested that it might be instructive to

Table 6-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program

(N = 186)*

(Low Score = High Importance)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.75	0.72	88
Men	9.90	0.59	98

* Data unavailable for three of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.60$; $p > .05$.

explore it further. What circumstances might have a bearing on the relationship between sex and the importance the principals assigned to the management of instruction? We reasoned that one condition would be their assessment of the competence of their staffs: men and women who have a high opinion of it would not differ appreciably in the importance they attribute to supervising instruction because they would recognize that their staffs had little need of help with it. But where women and men principals had a relatively low opinion of their staffs' competence, although they both would recognize that their teachers needed assistance, the women would attach greater importance to direction in matters of instruction than the men because of the higher value they set on their own ability to deal with classroom problems. This line of speculation led to the following analysis: we classified the principals into three categories on the basis of the proportion of their teachers whom they regarded as "[competent to] carry out their teaching assignments;" then recomputed the mean scores of the women and men principals on each of the sub-classifications of the data. If there is empirical support for our reasoning then only when principals set a relatively low value on their staffs' competence will the women among them attribute greater importance to supervising instruction than men. We found this to be the case: there is a statistically significant difference in the manner specified at below the .05 level between the mean scores of women and men on the factor, Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program, when principals admit to a relatively low opinion of their staffs but not when it is higher (Table 6-2).

Table 6-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program by Competence of Staff
(Low Score = High Importance)

Subclassification*	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Proba- bility Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Competence of Staff</u>						
Low	9.50	23	9.93	27	2.35	.05
Medium	9.89	32	10.03	36	0.95	n.s.
High	9.79	31	9.76	35	0.16	n.s.

*See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

We conclude, therefore, that a conditional rather than a general relationship exists between sex and assessment of the importance of supervising instruction.

Administrative Tasks

The school office, as well as the custodians, must be supervised; reports and correspondence must be dealt with; attendance, grade sheets, and the budget must be checked; records must be kept; and supplies must be ordered and distributed. The question we now examine is whether there is a difference by sex among principals in the importance they attribute to duties of this general sort.

Our prediction, that men would assess these more highly than women, was based on the same general line of reasoning we have just used. But in contrast to our assumption that women would regard themselves more highly than men as supervisors of instruction, we assumed that men would see themselves as the better administrators of the school routine.⁵

To test our prediction we compared the mean scores of the men and women principals on the factor, Importance Assigned to Administrative Tasks. The 11 items in this factor are:

- (1) Keeping school records.
- (2) Checking school attendance.
- (3) Taking inventory of equipment.
- (4) Ordering or distributing supplies.
- (5) Preparing reports for the higher administration of the school system.

- (6) Checking grade sheets or report cards.
- (7) Planning students' schedules or class plans.
- (8) Dealing with correspondence.
- (9) Keeping a watch on the school budget.
- (10) Managing the school office.
- (11) Supervising the custodial staff.

The same type of scoring procedure was used to develop a summary measure of the factor, Importance Assigned to Administrative Tasks, as was employed in gauging the importance principals attribute to the management of instruction.⁶

If our prediction is right, men should then receive a lower mean factor score than women since a low score represents a high value put upon Importance Assigned to Administrative Tasks. But, contrary to our expectation, women on the average attribute greater importance to the administrative functions than men: the mean factor score of the females is 9.58 as compared to 9.76 for the males (Table 6-3); however, the difference of 0.18 between the mean scores is not statistically significant at below the .05 level.⁷ We conclude, therefore, that men do not have a higher opinion than women of the importance of managing routine administrative affairs.

Self-evaluation

Management of the Instructional Program

Our prediction that men and women would assign differential importance to major functions of the principalship was based on assumptions

Table 6-3. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Importance Assigned to Administrative Tasks

(N = 186)*
(Low Score = High Importance)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.58	0.72	88
Men	9.76	0.75	98

* Data unavailable for three of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.64$; $p > .05$.

about their evaluation of their own abilities to perform them. Do women and men in fact vary in assessing their ability to carry out their major responsibilities? To examine this question we asked the principals to complete a Self-evaluation Instrument dealing with several aspects of their work. The response categories were: outstanding, excellent, good, fair, poor, and very poor. A number of the items in this instrument dealt with their ability to supervise instruction. Their replies to the items in the Instrument were given weights of from six to one, then intercorrelated and finally factor-analyzed, and one of the factors that emerged was characterized as an index of their evaluation of their own competence to lead in what pertains to instruction. The eight items in this factor, Self-assessment of Instructional Leadership Abilities are:

- (1) Getting experienced teachers to upgrade their performance.
- (2) Improving the performance of inexperienced teachers.
- (3) Getting teachers to use new educational methods.
- (4) Giving leadership to the instructional program.
- (5) Communicating the objectives of the school program to the faculty.
- (6) Getting teachers to coordinate their activities.
- (7) Knowing about the strengths and weaknesses of teachers.
- (8) Maximizing the different skills found in a faculty.⁸

When we compared the mean factor scores of the men and women principals, we found support for our prediction: women do rate themselves higher (10.28 vs. 9.85) on the ability to direct instruction than men (Table

6-4; a high score equals high self-evaluation). The sex difference of 0.43 in their mean factor scores is in the direction predicted and is statistically significant at below the .001 level.

When we set up sub-groupings of men and women principals according to the size of their schools and cities, we found differences between the sexes in each (Table 6-5). We come to similar conclusions when we establish sub-groupings according to the socio-economic composition of the pupils as a body, the principals' assessment of the competence of their staffs, the proportion of men teachers in their schools, and the variance in the age and the average age of their staffs. The findings in the entire sample are internally validated in 24 of the 25 sub-classifications of the data we examined. The single exception is of principals in the Eastern region of the country where the men's mean score was higher than that of the women. The high degree of consistency in these subsidiary findings increased our confidence in the conclusion that women on the average do set a higher value than men on their ability to supervise in matters of instruction.

Administrative Tasks

Do men and women also vary in their evaluation of their own ability to manage administrative affairs? To examine this question, we used another factor score, Self-assessment of Administrative Abilities, also derived from the administrators' responses to the Self-evaluation Instrument. The items in this factor are:

- (1) Keeping the school office running smoothly.
- (2) General planning for the school.

Table 6-4. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Self-assessment of Ability to Direct Instruction

(N = 189)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.28	0.75	91
Men	9.85	0.91	98

 $t = 3.47; p < .001.$

Table 6-5. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Self-assessment of Ability to Direct Instruction by Eight Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	10.52	0.59	13	9.92	0.91	20	+
Midwest	10.43	0.60	26	9.65	0.78	30	+
East	9.95	0.86	33	10.19	1.04	19	-
South	10.48	0.65	19	9.80	0.88	29	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.18	0.83	45	9.66	0.89	49	+
Medium	10.30	0.63	33	9.85	0.71	30	+
Large	10.57	0.68	13	10.34	1.05	19	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	10.33	0.86	33	9.88	0.90	30	+
Medium	10.07	0.56	37	9.64	0.91	27	+
Large	10.55	0.78	21	9.97	0.89	41	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.27	0.71	29	9.93	0.98	35	+
Middle	10.23	0.97	27	9.84	0.82	35	+
High	10.32	0.59	35	9.77	0.92	28	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 6-5. (Cont.)

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	10.12	0.93	24	9.96	1.12	27	+
Medium	10.28	0.65	33	9.71	0.72	36	+
High	10.42	0.69	32	9.91	0.89	35	+
<u>Proportion of Men Teachers</u>							
Low	10.41	0.62	30	9.85	0.98	28	+
Medium	10.17	0.88	32	9.78	0.85	36	+
High	10.27	0.72	29	9.93	0.91	34	+
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>							
Young	10.45	0.74	33	10.12	0.90	32	+
Middle	10.24	0.66	31	9.55	0.85	29	+
Old	10.12	0.83	26	9.85	0.90	37	+
<u>Variance in Teachers' Ages</u>							
Low	10.50	0.69	25	10.04	0.97	37	+
Medium	10.28	0.52	30	9.61	0.90	33	+
High	10.13	0.93	34	9.88	0.78	28	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

- (3) Directing the work of administrative assistants.
- (4) Cutting "red-tape" when fast action is needed.
- (5) Publicizing the work of the school.⁹

Our expectation was that the men would rate themselves more highly than the women for we assumed that the former would probably devote more time and effort to the administrative component of their work than the latter. We found, however, that although the men's mean score on the factor, Self-assessment of Administrative Abilities, was slightly higher than the women's (9.83 vs. 9.71), the difference of 0.12 is not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 6-6; a high score equals high self-evaluation). We conclude, therefore, that there is no sex difference among the principals in their evaluation of their own ability to manage routine administrative affairs.

Satisfactions

Supervision of the Instructional Program

Now we ask whether men and women differ in the gratification they find in carrying out their major responsibilities. We predicted that women would derive greater satisfaction than men from supervising instruction for two reasons: first, because of the women's greater interest in teaching as evidenced by their earlier choice of it as a vocation and the greater frequency with which they made it their first choice;¹⁰ and, secondly, because we thought that the greater teaching experience of women in the elementary school would lead them to be less frequently perplexed by problems in it.

Table 6-6. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Self-assessment of Administrative Abilities

(N = 189)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.71	0.79	91
Men	9.83	0.75	98

 $t = 1.05; p > .05.$

To determine whether our prediction received support we used the principals' responses to a Job Satisfaction Instrument which covered 26 different facets of their work. Of each item, they were asked whether they enjoyed performing it "a great deal," "very much," "somewhat," "very little," or "not at all." These responses were assigned weights from five to one, intercorrelated, and then subjected to a factor analysis. Seven items had high loadings on a factor reflecting satisfaction:

- (1) Working with "exceptionally able" teachers.
- (2) Working with "average" teachers.
- (3) Working with new teachers.
- (4) Supervising the instructional program.
- (5) Working with curriculum specialists.
- (6) Having the freedom to schedule one's own time.
- (7) Having a vacation from work periodically during the school year.¹¹

Using the type of procedure earlier described for obtaining factor scores, we computed a summary measure, Satisfaction Derived from Managing the Instructional Program, for each principal. A low score represents a high degree of satisfaction with instructional activities; therefore, if our prediction that women find greater satisfaction in managing the educational work of their schools than men is supported, the mean factor obtained by the women should be the lower of the two. The findings affirm the prediction: women do obtain a lower mean factor score than the men (9.88 vs. 10.21), and the difference of 0.33

between them is statistically significant at below the .01 level (Table 6-7).

When we recomputed the mean factor scores under different sub-classifications of the data, there was a high degree of internal consistency in the findings (Table 6-8). In small, medium, and large cities the women consistently had lower scores (that is, found greater satisfaction in work pertaining to instruction) than the men. The same conclusion was deduced from the scores computed according as the principals' staffs were characterized by variation in length of teaching experience or in average age. The findings were also internally validated when we examined the mean scores of the men and women principals on the following sub-groupings of the data: the principals' assessment of the competence of their staffs and the socio-economic composition of the body of pupils in their schools. The sex difference also maintained itself regardless of age or marital status, there being only one exception among the 24 comparisons we made: in the Eastern region of the nation the mean score of the women principals was slightly higher than that of the men. The remarkably high degree of consistency in these data increases our confidence in the finding of a sex difference in the entire sample. The evidence does support our prediction that women find greater satisfaction in work related to instruction than men.

Administrative Duties

If, as we have found, females in the principalship find greater gratification on the average than males in their tasks associated with

Table 6-7. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction
Derived from Managing the Instructional Program

(N = 189)
(Low Score = High Satisfaction)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.88	0.84	91
Men	10.21	0.85	98

$t = 2.74; p < .01.$

Table 6-8. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction Derived from Managing the Instructional Program by Eight Specified Subclassifications
(Low Score = High Satisfaction)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	9.54	0.81	13	10.34	1.02	20	+
Midwest	9.85	0.87	26	10.13	0.64	30	+
East	10.10	0.88	33	9.83	0.87	19	-
South	9.76	0.63	19	10.47	0.78	29	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.07	0.84	45	10.30	0.82	49	+
Medium	9.76	0.80	33	10.39	0.73	30	+
Large	9.47	0.77	13	9.71	0.90	19	+
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>							
Young	9.72	0.87	33	10.19	0.87	32	+
Middle	9.92	0.82	31	10.42	0.83	29	+
Old	10.01	0.83	26	10.08	0.81	37	+
<u>Mean Experience of Teachers</u>							
Short	9.54	0.90	30	10.24	0.85	33	+
Medium	10.09	0.71	28	10.41	0.83	33	+
Long	9.97	0.83	31	9.98	0.80	32	+

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 6-8. (Cont.)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	9.78	0.97	24	10.17	0.84	27	+
Medium	10.01	0.72	33	10.46	0.79	36	+
High	9.81	0.88	32	10.00	0.85	35	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	9.71	0.88	29	10.13	0.73	35	+
Middle	9.93	0.85	27	10.42	0.81	35	+
High	9.97	0.79	35	10.06	0.97	28	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	9.87	0.88	25	10.24	0.84	90	+
Single	9.90	0.85	57	9.93	1.08	5	+
Other	--	--	9	--	--	3	*
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	9.84	0.92	11	10.36	0.81	37	+
Middle	9.84	0.93	37	10.17	0.97	32	+
Old	9.91	0.74	43	10.08	0.71	29	+

See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

teaching and learning, do the men derive the greater satisfaction from performing their routine administrative duties? We predicted that they would. The reason we expected this was because we assumed that men would feel less comfortable than women in dealing with the schools' instructional problems and therefore would derive the greater pleasure from managerial responsibilities.

We used another factor score derived from the Job Satisfaction Instrument, Satisfaction Derived from Performing Administrative Tasks, based on seven items:

- (1) Supervising office personnel.
- (2) Supervising custodial personnel.
- (3) Preparing reports to the higher administration.
- (4) Preparing staff bulletins or announcements.
- (5) Handling administrative routine.
- (6) Allocating the school budget.
- (7) Evaluating teacher performance.¹²

In this instance, too, a low score reflects a high degree of satisfaction and therefore if our prediction was right we would expect to find men receiving a lower score than women on the factor, Satisfaction Derived from Administrative Activities. The findings are, in fact, that they do: the men's mean satisfaction score was 10.07 in comparison with the women's 10.39 and the difference of 0.32 between their scores is statistically significant at below the .01 level (Table 6-9). As in the case of our finding of a sex difference in satisfaction in managing the instructional program, in this instance, too, a high degree of

Table 6-9. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction
Derived from Performing Administrative Tasks

(N = 189)
(Low Score = High Satisfaction)

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.39	0.70	91
Men	10.07	0.86	98

$t = 2.80; p < .01.$

consistency appeared when the mean factor scores were compared of the men and women under various sub-groupings of the data (Table 6-10).

In 23 of 24 comparisons the sex difference found in the entire sample was internally replicated. In only one instance, in the largest cities, did the women obtain a lower factor score (that is, express greater satisfaction) on the administrative aspect of their work than the men. These findings lead us to conclude that men in the principalship obtain greater satisfaction than women from the administrative component of their work.

Table 6-10. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Satisfaction Derived from Performing Administrative Tasks by Eight Specified Subclassifications

(Low Score = High Satisfaction)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	10.39	0.66	13	10.27	0.65	20	+
Midwest	10.39	0.57	26	10.08	0.89	30	+
East	10.48	0.77	33	10.27	1.08	19	+
South	10.25	0.74	19	9.80	0.70	29	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	10.49	0.72	45	10.01	0.91	49	+
Medium	10.28	0.70	33	9.93	0.71	30	+
Large	10.36	0.54	13	10.46	0.85	19	-
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>							
Young	10.24	0.51	33	9.88	0.81	32	+
Middle	10.43	0.71	31	10.27	0.95	29	+
Old	10.52	0.83	26	10.08	0.79	37	+
<u>Mean Experience of Teachers</u>							
Short	10.30	0.65	30	10.02	0.75	33	+
Medium	10.36	0.64	28	10.16	0.91	33	+
Long	10.50	0.76	31	10.03	0.91	32	+

See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 6-10. (Cont.)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	10.65	0.61	24	10.02	0.86	27	+
Medium	10.27	0.72	33	10.01	0.89	36	+
High	10.36	0.68	32	10.17	0.83	35	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.38	0.68	29	10.20	0.83	35	+
Middle	10.44	0.66	27	9.87	0.79	35	+
High	10.37	0.74	35	10.16	0.93	28	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	10.26	0.62	25	10.08	0.83	90	+
Single	10.44	0.71	57	9.71	0.57	5	+
Other	--	--	9	--	--	3	*
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	10.69	0.66	11	10.11	0.67	37	+
Middle	10.38	0.71	37	10.14	0.97	32	+
Old	10.33	0.67	43	9.94	0.94	29	+

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

Notes and References for Chapter Six

1. This problem is considered in detail in another part of the National Principalship Study. See Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, The Professional Leadership of Elementary School Principals, Final Report No. 1 of Cooperative Research Project No. 853.

2. Evidence presented in Chapter Three revealed support for this assumption: the mean years of elementary teaching experience of the women principals was 14.7 years and that of the men was 4.6 years.

3. Evidence indicating that this assumption is valid is presented later in the chapter.

4. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the score, Importance Assigned to Managing the Instructional Program, see Appendix C, Table 3-10.

5. Evidence presented later in the chapter with respect to this assumption reveals that it receives no empirical support.

6. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the score, Importance Assigned to Administrative Tasks, see Appendix C, Table C-11.

7. This interpretation is based on the use of a two-tailed test since the empirical findings were in opposition to our prediction.

8. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the score, Self-assessment of Instructional Leadership Abilities, see Appendix C, Table C-12.

9. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the score, Self-assessment on Administrative Abilities, see Appendix C, Table C-13.

10. Evidence in support of this assumption has already been presented in Chapter Three: teaching was a first choice of 80 per cent of the women but only 46 per cent of the men.

11. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the score, Satisfaction Derived from Managing the Instructional Program, see Appendix C, Table C-14.

12. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the score, Satisfaction Derived from Performing Administrative Tasks, see Appendix C, Table C-15.

Chapter 7: Worry

Principals, like others, find much to worry about at work. Decisions, for one thing, are often a trying responsibility. Like business or governmental executives, they find themselves frequently forced to arrive at decisions for which they have incomplete information and these may have serious consequences. They must decide issues on which the staff may disagree and then suffer the consequences of unpopular decisions or downright miscalculations. Further, how well they do their work is judged in part by how well their subordinates do theirs and yet they may be hampered in influencing their staffs by such matters as tenure or seniority regulations.

Then, too, an elementary principal faces potential stress derived from a unique characteristic of the school: its indirect clients are the parents of the pupils but the principal stands in loco parentis and is legally responsible for the safety and welfare of a large body of young children. If a child is injured in his building, he is the one held accountable. In case of fire, he must see that the children are safely led out of the school. He must deal with those with emotional handicaps and difficulties in learning and at the same time must take into account not only their welfare but the rights of his teachers.

Moreover, the principal must cope with the complaints and demands, legitimate and otherwise, of parents. He may have to mollify parents who entertain views on discipline, grading, homework, and class assignments quite different from those held by his teachers or superiors.

In their manner of meeting these and other potential sources of stress principals differ among themselves. In this chapter, we inquire

whether there are also differences between male and female principals in this respect.

The Hypothesis

The hypothesis to be tested is that women principals worry less about their work than men. It was based on the following reasoning:

Among incumbents of an occupational position, the older worry less about problems connected with their work than the younger. Since, other things being equal, the older the individual, the greater his experience of life, be it at work or in the sphere of his personal affairs, we reasoned that his greater fund of experience would allow the older person to cope more effectively with his problems than the younger. If we assume that women principals tend to be older than men (and the evidence in Chapter Two supported this assumption) then it follows that women worry less over their work.

A second line of reasoning is based on a fact we have already established (Chapter Four): occupationally, men principals aspire higher than do the women. We assumed that among individuals who have achieved the same occupational position, the most ambitious professionally would worry more about how they do their work and the consequences it may have upon their careers. From these assumptions it follows that women principals worry less over their work than do their male colleagues.

The third line of reasoning is based on the premise that women evaluate their competence to supervise instruction more highly than men assess theirs, a statement that our data support (Chapter Six). The principal's activities, although one step removed from the process of teaching and

learning in the classrooms, are directly or indirectly related to it, particularly if he is one who works with and through his teachers in matters of pedagogy. We reasoned that principals who value most highly their own ability at these tasks would worry less than those whose assessment of themselves is lower, because the former could conduct themselves toward teachers and parents with greater self-assurance and self-confidence. And since we assumed that women set a higher value on their own competence to supervise instruction than men because of their longer and more varied teaching experience in the elementary school and their familiarity with its recurrent problems, we reasoned that women principals would worry less than men.

Testing the Hypothesis

The replies of the principals to a "Worry Instrument" furnished the data to test the hypothesis. It was designed to elicit the frequency ("very frequently," "frequently," "sometimes," "almost never," "never") with which a principal worried about 11 typical problems or situations, for example, about reactions to his decisions, possible physical injuries to pupils, the impression he makes on teachers and parents, or what transpires at his school when he is away from it.

A six-item Guttman scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of .907 was developed from their responses.¹ When we compared the mean scores made by the men with those of the women, the finding gave ground for the hypothesis: the men had a higher mean scale score than the women (3.12 vs. 2.67) and the difference of 0.45 is statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 7-1).

Table 7-1. Mean, Frequency and Percentage Distribution of Women and Men Principals on the Worry Scale

Worry Scale Score	Women		Men	
	Frequency	Per Cent	Frequency	Per Cent
6	5	5	8	8
5	6	7	14	14
4	14	15	14	14
3	28	31	26	27
2	17	19	26	27
1	9	10	2	2
0	12	13	8	8
	91	100	98	100
Mean Scale Score	2.67		3.12	

$t = 1.94; p < .05.$

Could this relationship between the principal's sex and his proneness to worry be due to the influence of a confounding third variable? To examine this possibility we considered the possible impact of two variables on the primary relationship: marital status and size of school. The argument could be advanced that married principals may be more predisposed to worry than those who are single because the former, in general, must support a greater number of economic dependents than the latter. It also seems plausible that size of school is positively related to worry: the more pupils the greater the likelihood of stress upon the principal. If either variable is positively related to worry and more of the males are married and generally administer larger schools than the women, then one or both of these conditions could impugn the primary relationship.

To examine these possibilities we re-examined the relationship between sex and worry, holding constant first, marital status, and then size of school and found that regardless of their marital status or the number of pupils the men had higher scores on the Worry Scale than women principals (Table 7-2). The relationship between sex and worry, therefore, cannot be attributed to the influence of either of the variables.²

To determine the degree of internal replication of sex difference in worrying under various other groupings of the data, we sub-classified the men and women principals by region, socio-economic level of school, size of city, mean extent of experience in teaching, and the competence of the staff as perceived by the principal (Table 7-3). The findings were that in all regions, in schools whose bodies of pupils varied in

Table 7-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Worry by Marital Status and Size of School

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	3.00	1.33	25	3.09	1.60	90	+
Single	--	--	55	--	--	4	*
Other	--	--	8	--	--	3	*
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	2.88	1.51	33	3.53	1.50	30	+
Medium	2.51	1.60	37	3.22	1.55	27	+
Large	2.62	1.70	21	2.76	1.59	41	+

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

Table 7-3. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Worry by Five Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	2.46	1.45	13	3.25	1.61	20	+
Midwest	2.23	1.28	26	3.20	1.40	30	+
East	3.00	1.81	33	3.16	1.81	19	+
South	2.84	1.56	19	2.93	1.57	29	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	2.86	1.68	29	2.91	1.46	35	+
Middle	2.96	1.79	27	3.23	1.49	35	+
High	2.29	1.28	35	3.25	1.81	28	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	2.38	1.45	45	3.22	1.31	49	+
Medium	3.15	1.79	33	2.90	1.81	30	-
Large	2.46	1.28	13	3.21	1.79	19	+
<u>Mean Teacher Experience</u>							
Low	3.10	1.54	30	3.61	1.82	33	+
Middle	2.32	1.58	28	2.91	1.26	33	+
High	2.48	1.60	31	2.84	1.50	32	+
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	3.17	1.60	24	3.59	1.39	27	+
Middle	2.73	1.73	33	3.08	1.48	36	+
High	2.13	1.28	32	2.80	1.74	35	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

socio-economic status and whose teachers varied in the extent of experience and in competence, the mean Worry Score of the women was lower than that of the men. In two of the three categories of size of city, the women had lower mean Worry Scores; in one, cities of medium size, the men principals had the lower scores. The consistency of the sex differences in 15 out of the 16 sub-classifications of the data strengthened us in our confidence in the findings from the whole sample.

Test of the Reasoning

Now we will investigate whether the lines of reasoning on which the hypothesis of a sex difference in worry was based can claim empirical backing. We reasoned that three variables intervened between the sex of principals and their disposition to worry about their work: age, level of aspiration, and self-evaluation of ability to direct instruction. In brief, the reasoning was as follows: (1) If age is negatively associated with worry, and if women principals are older than men principals, then the women will worry less than the men. (2) If aspiration is negatively related to worry, and if women principals' aspirations are lower than men principals', then the women will worry less than the men. (3) If self-evaluation of competence to direct instruction is negatively related to worry, and if the women rate themselves higher in it than the men, then the women will worry less than men.

Following the procedures we used in previous chapters to test the reasoning underlying hypotheses, we determined if each intervening variable was related to both the independent variable (sex) and the dependent one (worry) in the assumed way. If these connections do not exist,

then basic assumptions underlying the hypothesis are not tenable. If the evidence supports them, we may proceed to the next step.

The data required to test the association between the intervening and the independent and dependent variables are presented in Table 7-4. With regard to age, aspiration, and self-evaluation of competence to direct instruction, three findings appear which were reported earlier: that women principals are older on the average and admit to a lower level of aspiration than the men and that women tend to set a higher value on their own ability to direct instruction than men (the table indicates these relationships in terms of point-biserial correlation coefficients). The table also reveals that age, aspiration, and self-evaluation are related to worry as we assumed: age and self-evaluation of ability to direct instruction are negatively correlated with worry, and aspiration is positively related to it at below the .05 level.

Now we inquire whether these three variables meet the final condition required if they are to be viewed as intervening between sex and worry--the condition being that the size of the relationship between the independent variable (sex) and the dependent one (worry) diminishes when each of them is held constant. First, we shall report the zero-order point-biserial relationship between sex and worry, and then the first-order partial relationships between these two factors, holding constant first, age, then aspiration, and finally self-evaluation. Then we shall present higher-order partial correlation coefficients in which these variables will be held constant simultaneously.

The zero-order (point-biserial) correlation coefficient between sex

Table 7-4. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Worry)

(N = 189)

Assumed Intervening Variable	Sex [#] (Point-biserial r)	Worry (Pearsonian r)
Age	.31*	-.25*
Level of aspiration	-.38*	.12*
Self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program	.25*	-.18*

Female = 1; male = 0.

* $p < .05$.

and worry is $-.14$. When age is held constant, the relationship decreases to $-.07$. It drops only slightly when level of aspiration and self-evaluation are held constant, to $-.11$ and $-.10$ respectively.

When we hold constant both age and level of aspiration, the relationship between sex and worry drops to $-.06$, but when we hold constant age, aspiration, and self-evaluation, the relationship decreases to $-.02$ (Table 7-5). We conclude then that age, aspiration, and self-evaluation in combination may account for the relationship between sex and worry, for when all three are held constant simultaneously, the relationship between sex and worry virtually disappears.

Further Analyses

We now examine the responses of the principals to the 11 questions in the Worry Instrument to learn what given aspects of their work cause them to worry and to see if there are any important sex differences in this respect (Table 7-6).

For all principals, the greatest worry was caused by the fact of their standing in loco parentis, and as such, as noted earlier, being legally responsible for the safety and welfare of the young children in their schools. Nearly 40 per cent of them reported that they frequently or very frequently and over one-third said they sometimes worried about possible physical injury to the children. Over twice the proportion of women replied "never" or "almost never" as of the men (35 per cent vs. 16 per cent).

To what extent do principals worry when they deal with parents? Over 60 per cent reported that they worry "sometimes" or oftener over

Table 7-5. Zero-order, First-order and Higher-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Worry

(N = 189)

	Zero-order <u>r</u>	First-order Partial <u>r</u>	Higher-order Partial <u>r</u>
Sex and Worry	-.14		
<u>Holding constant:</u>			
Age		-.07	
Level of aspiration		-.11	
Self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program		-.10	
Age and level of aspiration			-.06
Age, level of aspiration, and self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program			-.02

Table 7-6. Percentage Distribution and Mean of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the Eleven Items on Worry

<u>The Question</u>		<u>The Response Choices</u>							
To what extent does each of the following occur in your situation?		A = I very frequently B = I frequently C = I sometimes			D = I almost never E = I never				
Item [#]		Per Cent of Principals Responding					N	Mean	Direction of Difference
		A (5)	B (4)	C (3)	D (2)	E (1)			
1. Worry about possible physical injuries to individual students while they are at school.*	W	17%	13%	34%	24%	11%	(90)	3.0	M > W
	M	19	28	37	13	3	(98)	3.5	
7. Am concerned about the impression I will make when I have to speak to a group of parents.*	W	3	13	46	24	13	(91)	2.7	M > W
	M	8	19	36	28	8	(98)	3.0	
10. Have anxiety when I deal with "complaining" parents.	W	1	7	39	40	14	(91)	2.4	M > W
	M	0	14	42	34	10	(98)	2.6	
11. Feel nervous when I attend PTA or other parent meetings.	W	1	1	13	36	48	(91)	1.7	M > W
	M	0	1	18	49	31	(98)	1.9	
8. Am concerned about the impression I will make when I have to speak to a group of teachers.*	W	3	19	36	23	17	(91)	2.7	M > W
	M	7	20	35	29	9	(98)	2.9	

Items are numbered according to their position in the 11-item research instrument.

* Item was included in Worry Scale.

Table 7-6. (Cont.)

The Question		The Response Choices							
To what extent does each of the following occur in your situation?		A = I very frequently B = I frequently C = I sometimes			D = I almost never E = I never				
Item#	Per Cent of Principals Responding						Mean	Direction of Difference	
	A (5)	B (4)	C (3)	D (2)	E (1)	N			
3. Am concerned that what I do or say may cause me to be disliked by my teachers.	W	2%	7%	34%	34%	23%	(91)	2.3	M > W
	M	3	10	42	33	11	(97)	2.6	
9. Find myself worrying whether I have made the right decision on a matter with which I have just dealt.	W	3	9	42	37	9	(91)	2.6	M > W
	M	5	11	50	30	3	(98)	2.8	
4. Worry about what an individual or group may do if I make a decision contrary to their wishes.*	W	1	5	26	41	25	(91)	2.2	M > W
	M	0	1	42	45	12	(98)	2.3	
2. Worry about the possible occurrence of a "disaster" (e.g., serious fire, food poisoning, etc.) at my school.	W	7	6	19	35	34	(91)	2.2	M > W
	M	5	9	33	39	13	(98)	2.5	

Items are numbered according to their position in the 11-item research instrument.

* Item was included in Worry Scale.

Table 7-6. (Cont.)

<u>The Question</u>		<u>The Response Choices</u>							
To what extent does each of the following occur in your situation?		A = I very frequently			D = I almost never				
		B = I frequently			E = I never				
		C = I sometimes							
Item [#]	Per Cent of Principals Responding					N	Mean	Direction of Difference	
	A (5)	B (4)	C (3)	D (2)	E (1)				
5. Worry about what is going on in my school when I am away from it for any length of time during school hours.*	W	3%	12%	16%	41%	27%	(91)	2.2	M > W
	M	4	13	30	33	20	(98)	2.5	
6. Am kept awake at night thinking about problems associated with my job.*	W	2	1	35	37	24	(91)	2.2	M = W
	M	3	3	28	41	24	(98)	2.2	

Items are numbered according to their position in the 11-item research instrument.

* Item was included in Worry Scale.

the impression they make when speaking to groups of parents and approximately 30 per cent confessed that they worried to the same extent when they deal with complaining parents. Over 80 per cent of the administrators claimed that they never or almost never "felt nervous" when attending P.T.A. or other parent meetings. It seems that attendance at large gatherings of parents is less an ordeal for most principals than speaking to them in small groups or dealing with them as individuals. Over each type of contact with parents, the women reported that they worried less frequently than did the men.

To what extent do principals worry about their relationships with teachers? Approximately 60 per cent reported that they worry "sometimes" or more often about the impression they make when speaking to a group of teachers and nearly one-half admitted that they were concerned with equal frequency about the possibility that the teachers would respond unfavorably. Nearly twice as many women as men claimed never to worry about either of these two eventualities.

Approximately three out of five of the elementary school administrators reported that they "sometimes" or more frequently worry about whether they have made the "right" decision, but less than two out of five said that they worry "frequently" or "sometimes" about what an individual or group may do if the principals' decisions run contrary to their wishes. Principals are apparently more concerned about the appropriateness of their decisions than about pressure because of them. In both cases the women, again, worried, on the whole, less than the men.

A majority of the principals reported that they "never" or "almost

never" worry about either the possible occurrence of a disaster at school or what transpires when they are away from the building during school hours. These possibilities concern events over which they can exercise little control. Women, however, again reported less frequent worry over either than did the men.

Finally, over three-fifths of the principals indicated that they "never" or "almost never" were kept awake at night thinking about problems associated with their job. Interestingly, there was no sex difference here. As to 10 of the 11 items in the Worry Instrument, however, the men worried more frequently than the women.

One final question: do the men and women principals worry about given aspects of their work to about the same extent? By giving weights of from five to one to the response categories in the Worry Instrument, computing a mean score for the responses of the men and the women to each item, and then ranking the items by frequency of worry according to sex, we found (Table 7-7) that the rank order of frequency of worry is highly similar as between the sexes. We, therefore, conclude that for each sex the areas of relatively great and little worry are approximately the same.

Table 7-7. Rank Ordering of the Responses of Women and Men Principals to the Eleven Items on Worry

Item*	Rank Order of Responses	
	Women	Men
1. Worry about possible physical injuries to individual students while they are at school.	1	1
7. Am concerned about the impression I will make when I have to speak to a group of parents.	2	2.5
8. Am concerned about the impression I will make when I have to speak to a group of teachers.	3.5	2.5
9. Find myself worrying whether I have made the right decision on a matter with which I have just dealt.	3.5	4
3. Am concerned that what I do or say may cause me to be disliked by my teachers.	2	3.5
10. Have anxiety when I deal with "complaining" parents.	6	5.5
5. Worry about what is going on in my school when I am away from it for any length of time during school hours.	8.5	7.5
2. Worry about the possible occurrence of a "disaster" (e.g., serious fire, food poisoning, etc.) at my school.	8.5	9

* Items are numbered according to their position in the 11-item research instrument.

Table 7-7. (Cont.)

Item*	Rank Order of Responses	
	Women	Men
4. Worry about what an individual or group may do if I make a decision contrary to their wishes.	8.5	9
6. Am kept awake at night thinking about problems associated with my job.	8.5	10
11. Feel nervous when I attend PTA or other parent meetings.	11	11

* Items are numbered according to their position in the 11-item research instrument.

Notes and References for Chapter Seven

1. See Appendix C, Table C-2, for the technical details of the construction of the Worry Scale.
2. In the case of marital status, the mean Worry Scale scores of the men and women principals were only compared for those who were married because the number of men who were single or had other marital status (widowed or divorced) was in each instance less than five (Table 7-2). For both these marital subclassifications, however, the men had higher Worry Scale scores than the women (4.20 vs. 2.60 for the single principals; and 2.33 vs. 2.22 for the widowed and divorced).

Chapter 8: The Principal and his Professional Staff: Supervisory Control

In most bureaucratic organizations, the existence and the exercise of hierarchical authority is taken for granted and a school, being a type of bureaucracy, is no different. In its structure of authority the principal, as the administrator of the school unit, exercises authority over the conduct of the organization and is responsible for the performance of the teachers in his building.

However, certain characteristics of schools may restrict the control superordinates exercise over their subordinates. Teachers, who carry out the basic function of the school, are professionals; and professionals, we generally assume, are committed to individual autonomy.¹ For a professional claims the right to know what his clients' interests are and what "best" serves their interests, with no direction or interference from fellow practitioners or, if he is employed by an organization, from superordinates. This is a norm which appears to stand in direct contradiction to hierarchical authority.²

An examination of school board rules and regulations in various cities and of the educational literature reveals that teachers are supposed to be "supervised," usually by the principal and/or central office specialists. In fact, in the professional literature, "instructional leadership," the term used instead of supervision, is regarded as the principal's proper and major responsibility. That hierarchical authority and individual autonomy may not be irreconcilable is suggested by research on different types of complex organizations. Some recent studies³ indicate that such organizations are not as rigid and inflexible as the model developed by Weber implies. Other studies reveal

that the behavior permissible to professionals is wider in scope than their ethical codes or public pronouncements would suggest;⁴ that how supervision is given (directly by way of order and dictum or indirectly as advice and persuasion), how much is given, and whether it has reference to professional or administrative matters are key questions in determining whether professional autonomy exists and, if so, to what extent.⁵

Our attention will be focused on whether men and women principals differ in exerting control over their teachers' behavior. Or, to put it another way: do men and women principals differ in the autonomy they allow their subordinates?

A supervisor never decides alone on how much control to exercise over his subordinates for in exercising his authority, he not only controls but is, to some extent, controlled by those under him.⁶ Several studies of nonprofessional personnel, carried out in various contexts, suggest that the norms and values of subordinates relative to supervision set the actual as opposed to the official limits of the supervisor's behavior.⁷ The supervisor can ignore the norms and attitudes of those below him, it is true, but only at the risk of seeing his orders ignored or circumvented. Of course, the formal power of the supervisor and that of his subordinates are seldom equal; the supervisor obviously enjoys more.

Differential authority raises the issue of the sanctions and rewards which the supervisor--in this case, the principal--may mete out. In most school systems few specific formal rewards and penalties can follow upon the teachers' compliance or noncompliance with the principal's

authority. Usually, a principal submits periodic written reports on his teachers to the central administrative office, a procedure which gives him, as it were, a kind of diffuse power of sanction over them. Informally, he can reward "cooperation" or punish the lack of it in several ways. He can assign "good" or "tough" classes to teachers or he can reward or punish in distributing routine non-teaching duties among them, e.g., corridor and recess duty and committee assignments. He can lend or withhold support and backing in conflicts with parents or pupils.

On their side, teachers have various protective mechanisms and punitive devices at their disposal. Experienced teachers are covered by tenure and proceedings to discharge a teacher are very rare in the public schools, reserved for only the extreme instances of unprofessional behavior. In most systems, a teacher also has the right to apply to the central office for transfer to another school, and a common informal index for evaluating a principal's performance is the number and frequency of requests to be transferred from his school. In addition, professionals may enjoy the technique of passive resistance more successfully as industrial workers, in which case suggestions or even orders from a superior are largely ignored. Of the two, the principal's punitive weapons are probably more potent than the teacher's in being more immediate and direct in their effect.

Control over Professional Activities

We mentioned earlier that the type of activity over which control or supervision is exercised may be an important circumstance influencing

whether, or to what extent, professional autonomy exists in the schools. A study of supervisory control among physicians in a hospital⁸ indicates that professional norms do not require, as has sometimes been thought, that the physician have control over all aspects of his work, but only those classified as professional in contrast to the non-professional or administrative. He will even accept indirect control over professional activities, such as the care of a patient, in the form of advice, influence, or persuasion if it is offered as advice subject to his critical review. He will accept direct authority, by way of order or dictum, only about the routine administrative concerns of the organization, for example, scheduling the times at which he sees patients. Many teachers probably make a similar distinction about the type of control that is appropriate to different activities. The principal, once a teacher himself, is no doubt cognizant of their attitudes, but he is officially responsible for maintaining their performance at a high level in his school. Control over professional activities, then, is an important and sensitive area for both teachers and principals.

As in the hospital, advice and suggestion seem to be the most frequently used modes of control over teachers' professional activities in the school.⁹ But, it should be noted, there are two kinds of advice: requested and unsolicited. The latter has very different connotation from the former; it indicates a questioning of professional competence and therefore is likely to be received with affect by the professional involved. As Coss notes: "Whether actual strain and its potential consequence, rejection of supervision, will occur would seem to depend

upon the existence of conditions which lead the advisee to respect the advisor and his opinions, and which allow the advisor himself to feel capable of offering adequate advice."¹⁰ Goss cites three circumstances which affect the giving and receiving of unsolicited advice by physicians: professional competence, rank, and availability of information about the patient.¹¹ The giver of advice must approximately equal or exceed the recipient in professional competence; the adviser's formal rank must be the same or higher than that of those he advises; and he must be able to examine the patient whom his advice concerns. In the hospital clinic, where these conditions rarely occur, supervising physicians feel constrained to offer advice only about relatively routine details of professional performance.

But what happens in the school? The principal's formal rank is higher than his teachers', and he may at will observe a child or teaching situation in most elementary schools. The issue of the superordinate's greater professional competence, however, may or may not apply in a given school. It is particularly relevant to our problem in view of the differences in teaching experience as between men and women, prior to their becoming principals (Chapter Three, Table 3-20). We shall take this circumstance into account in framing a hypothesis about sex differences in the principals' exercise of control in their schools.

The Hypothesis

Which principals exert more control over their teachers' professional activities--men or women? The hypothesis to be tested is that women principals exercise more control over their teachers than men

principals. It was based on the following lines of reasoning:

We started with the idea that the more qualified or technically competent a superior of professional subordinates is, the greater will be his efforts to influence their behavior and the more willing they will be to accept it. In the case of principals, those who possess greater teaching skills, knowledge of classroom problems, and diagnostic ability could be expected to exert greater control over their teachers. If we assume that women principals have greater professional experience as elementary school teachers than men, and as a consequence possess greater technical competence than men, then it follows that women will exercise greater control over their staffs than men principals.¹²

A second line of reasoning concerned the effect of a superior's assessment of his ability to direct the instructional program: the more positively he evaluates his competence to offer informed and useful advice to his professional subordinates, the more control, we assumed, he will exercise over their performance. If we further assume that women principals, because of their greater experience as elementary school teachers and greater enjoyment of those managerial activities directly related to the instructional program, place a higher value on their own professional capabilities,¹³ it follows that women will exercise more control over their teachers than will men principals.

A third idea relevant to the hypothesis is that superordinates who give greater primacy to their work, in comparison with other positions they occupy, can be expected to be more concerned about the functioning

of their organizations and therefore exercise greater control over what takes place in them. We emphasized earlier the greater significance in most cases to men than to women in American society of occupational roles and made the point that women are more frequently confronted with obstacles in achieving managerial and supervisory positions. Since women typically find it more difficult than men to attain principalships, we posit that they give greater primacy to it, relative to their other positions, than men. And if, as we further assumed, the primacy attributed by a superordinate to his work is positively related to the control he exercises over his staff, then it follows that women principals will exert more control over their subordinates than men.

Three lines of reasoning lead then to the hypothesis that women principals exercise more control over the professional activities of their teachers than men principals. Do the data support the hypothesis?

Testing the Hypothesis

Our measure of the principal's control over teachers' professional activities was based on the responses of the teacher-observers in each school to the following eight questions: "How frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") does your principal [engage in the following kinds of activities]?"

- (1) Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.
- (2) Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.
- (3) Require teachers to keep the principal informed about "problem"

children in their classrooms.

- (4) Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.
- (5) Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.
- (6) Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.
- (7) Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.
- (8) Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.

Seven of the eight questions focus on maintaining some kind of control over the teachers' performance of their professional activities. Some of the behavior described by the items depend on the teacher's initiative; for example, reporting parental conferences and keeping the principal informed about problem children. Others imply initiative on the principal's part, for example, visiting classes regularly and checking written lesson plans. The eighth question, "How frequently does your principal determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school?" is not as obviously related to the control of the teachers' professional tasks, but the guidance program can impinge on the teacher-pupil relationship in a number of ways; hence its relevance.

These items were selected on the basis of a factor analysis (see Chapter One) of 22 items dealing with various ways school administrators can exercise control over their subordinates' performance that

were included in a Role Behavior Instrument covering several dimensions of the principals' behavior. The procedure we used to obtain the best estimate of how the principal exercised control was as follows: first on the basis of the teachers' responses to the eight questions, a score for each teacher was computed based on the weights derived from the loadings of items included in the factor.¹⁴ The teacher-observer scores in each school were then averaged to obtain the best estimate of the degree to which principals control teachers' professional activities.¹⁵

A comparison of the mean scores obtained by the women and men principals reveals support for the hypothesis: the women secured higher scores than the men (8.94 vs. 7.67) and the difference of 1.27 is statistically significant at below the .001 level (Table 8-1). Women principals, then, do exercise more control over the professional activities of their teachers than men.

Earlier studies of supervisory behavior¹⁶ show that the degree of control exercised by superiors can be influenced by the size of the work unit and the experience of subordinates. It is important to inquire if the sex difference we have found is spurious; that is, could these and other variables such as the principal's evaluation of the teachers' competence and the principal's age and marital status explain away the relationship? We took these specific variables into account for the following reasons: the smaller a work unit, the more time a superordinate may have for supervision, and the less competent or experienced his staff is, the more effort he could be expected to expend on controlling them. If women, on the average, were administrators of

Table 8-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities
(N = 175)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	8.94	1.88	86
Men	7.67	1.93	89

* Data unavailable for 14 of the 189 principals.

$t = 4.37; p < .001.$

smaller schools and had less competent or experienced staffs than men, then the sex difference we uncovered might be explained by these confounding variables. Earlier, we reported our findings that the women tended to be noticeably older than the men, and that most of the women (two-thirds) were single in contrast to 10 per cent of the men. Cases could be made to support the arguments that with increasing age control increases and that single principals, being able to devote more time to their work than the married, hence exhibit greater control over the performance of their teachers.

To explore these artifact possibilities, we now re-examine the relationship between sex and control, holding constant each of these third variables. If the direction of the original finding is maintained among the principals in each category of the variable, then the artifact variable cannot be said to account for the relationship. If the direction does not persist, then the original conclusion must be modified.

The findings are that for each of the 13 comparisons we were able to make, the mean factor score of the women principals is higher than that of the men (Table 8-2). The magnitude of the differences varies, but not their direction. We conclude that the relationship is not an artifact of any of these third variables.

To explore the internal consistency of the finding for the total sample, four additional sub-classifications of the data were used: region, socio-economic level of school, size of city, and the proportion of men teachers on the teaching staff. When the relationship between sex and the principals' control of their teachers' behavior is

Table 8-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities by Five Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification [†]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	9.21	1.46	30	8.01	1.95	26	+
Medium	8.71	2.06	35	7.53	1.84	25	+
Large	8.93	2.06	21	7.53	1.94	38	+
<u>Mean Teacher Experience</u>							
Short	8.98	1.82	29	8.23	1.97	29	+
Medium	9.39	1.73	27	7.55	1.90	30	+
Long	8.51	2.01	29	7.25	1.77	30	+
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	9.30	1.99	23	8.16	1.95	26	+
Middle	8.55	1.99	30	7.83	1.97	32	+
High	9.06	1.96	31	7.09	1.70	31	+
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	9.06	1.80	11	8.04	2.01	32	+
Middle	8.73	2.26	34	7.72	1.85	30	+
Old	9.07	1.48	41	7.18	1.79	27	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	8.02	1.76	23	7.63	1.89	82	+
Single	--	--	55	--	--	4	•
Other	--	--	8	--	--	3	•

[†] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No test made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

examined under these various sets of conditions, the findings are that in 12 of the 13 subgroupings the women principals score higher than the men (Table 8-3). The one exception is the principals of schools in the largest cities. The high degree of consistency of these analyses increases our confidence in the original finding.

Examination of the Rationale Underlying the Hypothesis

We reasoned that three variables, professional competence, self-confidence, and primacy of work role, intervened between the sex of principals and their control over their teachers' professional activities. The rationale, in brief, was: (1) if women principals have more professional competence than men principals, and if professional competence is positively related to degree of control, then women principals will exercise more control. (2) If women principals have more professional self-confidence than men, and if this is positively related to control, then it should follow that women principals will exercise more control than men principals. (3) If women principals give greater primacy to their work role than men principals, and it is positively related to control, then women principals will exert more control over their teachers' activities than men principals.

We shall follow the same procedures used in earlier chapters in testing the reasoning underlying this hypothesis. The first step is to see if each intervening variable is related to both the independent variable (sex) and the dependent variable (control) in the manner specified. If these relationships do not exist, then the assumptions underlying the hypothesis are not tenable. If they do, then we can proceed to the next step.

Table 8-3. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities by Four Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	8.28	1.74	10	6.99	1.49	17	+
Midwest	8.84	1.78	26	7.15	2.15	27	+
East	9.67	1.69	32	8.88	1.39	17	+
South	8.13	1.94	18	8.09	1.67	28	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	8.98	1.83	26	8.11	2.03	32	+
Middle	9.74	1.50	25	7.62	1.85	30	+
High	8.78	1.98	35	7.21	1.77	27	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	9.02	1.98	45	7.65	2.07	46	+
Medium	9.24	1.53	29	6.94	1.56	27	+
Large	7.91	1.93	12	8.99	1.26	16	-
<u>Proportion of Men Teachers</u>							
Low	8.86	1.76	27	7.80	1.90	26	+
Middle	9.06	2.07	31	7.15	1.81	30	+
High	8.88	1.76	28	8.04	1.94	33	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

The data necessary to test the association between the intervening and the independent and dependent variables show that (Table 8-4):

- (1) the women's competence as indexed by years of elementary teaching experience is greater than the men's, and it is positively correlated with control.
- (2) the women have a higher self-evaluation of their ability to direct the instructional program than the men, and it is positively related to control over professional staff.
- (3) women give greater primacy to their work role, as indexed by the nights spent on school business, than men; and it is also positively correlated with control.

Each of these three variables, then, is related to the independent and dependent variables as required. Now we will determine whether the evidence supports the final condition required for them to be considered as intervening variables: the zero-order relationship between sex and control should decrease when the third variable is held constant. First, we present the zero-order point-biserial relationship between sex and control,¹⁷ and then the first-order partial relationships between them, holding constant, first, years of elementary teaching experience, next, self-evaluation of competence in instructional activities, and then nights spent on school business. Finally, we will present a series of higher-order partial correlation coefficients, in which two and then three of the explanatory variables will be held constant simultaneously (Table 8-5).

Table 8-4. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Control over Teachers' Professional Activities)
(N = 175)

Assumed Intervening Variable	Sex [‡] (Point-biserial r)	Control over Teachers' Professional Activities (Pearsonian r)
Years of elementary school teaching experience	.60*	.29*
Self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program	.25*	.14*
Nights spent on school business	.20*	.22*

‡ Female = 1; male = 0.

* $p < .05$.

Table 8-9. Zero-order, First-order and Higher-order Partial Correlation Coefficients of Sex and Control over Teachers' Professional Activities

(N = 175)

	Zero-order r	First-order Partial r	Higher-order Partial r
Sex and Control over Teachers' Professional Activities	.32		
<u>Holding Constant:</u>			
Years of elementary school teaching experience		.19	
Self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program		.29	
Nights spent on school business		.26	
Years of elementary school teaching experience and self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program			.16
Years of elementary school teaching experience, self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program, and nights spent on school business			.12

The zero-order point-biserial correlation coefficient between sex and control over professional staff is .32. When the number of years of elementary teaching experience is held constant, the relationship declines to .19. It diminishes only slightly to .29 when self-evaluation is held constant, and again only to .28 when primacy of work role is held constant. Holding constant each of the intervening variables does decrease the relationship between the independent and dependent variables, but the "third variables" differ considerably in the extent to which they influence the original correlation coefficient: years of elementary teaching experience results in the sharpest drop, while removing self-evaluation and primacy of work role has slight effect.

When both years of elementary teaching experience and self-evaluation in combination are held constant, the correlation coefficient of .32 (zero-order) drops to .16 (second-order partial correlation). When the linear effect of work role primacy is removed in addition, the coefficient decreases further to .12 (third-order partial correlation). These findings suggest that among the three variables, years of elementary teaching experience has the greatest single impact on the relationship between sex and control over professional staff, but that all three of them in combination have the greatest influence on it. We interpret these findings as supporting the possibility that the three variables posited as intervening between the principal's sex and control over the professional staff may in fact be operating in this manner.

Further Analyses

An examination of the behavior of the men and women on the individual items included in the control measure may elaborate in another way our understanding of the exercise of authority in the school and sex differences in it. The mean scores¹⁸ for the men and women principals on the items are presented in Table 8-6.

In which areas do both women and men exert the greatest and least control? The means of the items indicate that determining "what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school" evokes the highest degree of control by both men and women principals. The guidance program is an ancillary service which can and often does have implications for teacher-pupil relationships and teacher-principal relationships. In the elementary school, problems of learning or discipline requiring counseling and vocational guidance are usually referred to guidance personnel by the teacher with the consent of the principal. Because guidance services are supplementary to, rather than an integral part of, the instructional program, principals perhaps feel it most necessary to exercise control over them.

Both men and women principals exert least control over checking on their teachers' written lesson plans; this is usually done "occasionally" by women and slightly less frequently by men. Generally, written lesson plans are considered important for beginning teachers; without specific planning, lessons may be disorganized and attention and rapport with the class lost. For the experienced teacher, the feeling probably is that "she knows what she's doing," and detailed outlines are not necessary. The fact that experienced teachers predominate

Table 8-6. Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities

Item*	Women			Men		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:						
1. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	3.43	0.57	86	3.18	0.50	89
2. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	3.67	0.67	86	3.21	0.60	89
3. Require teachers to keep the principal informed about "problem" children in their classrooms.	3.62	0.54	86	3.37	0.56	89
4. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	3.61	0.53	86	3.40	0.58	89
5. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	3.74	0.51	86	3.39	0.57	89
6. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	2.89	1.04	86	2.56	1.13	89
7. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	3.61	0.51	86	3.53	0.44	89
8. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	3.86	0.54	86	3.61	0.51	89

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

numerically over beginning teachers may explain the principals' responses.

On what aspects of control do men and women differ? The sharpest differences occur on the two items: "require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards" and "ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal." In both instances, the women principals' mean is closer to the "almost always" response, while the men principals' is closer to the "occasionally" category. In line with our reasoning on the control hypothesis, we might speculate that women principals are more likely to require their teachers to conform to their standards than men, because women, due to their greater experience, are more confident that their standards are sound and legitimate, and that they therefore can obtain greater conformity to them than the men.

The item on which the men and women principals differ least is "know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day." According to their teachers, both men and women principals usually have some idea about what is going on in their classrooms. Our informal observations in schools suggest that this is probably accomplished by walking around the building or stopping for brief informal visits to each classroom. Our data also suggest that women, however, are more likely to go another step and request that teacher-parent conferences be reported to them. In one sense, this is an indirect means of control; from another perspective, it is a device for gaining a more complete picture of the actual or potential problems of their staffs.

Women principals are more likely to exercise control over their teachers than men in the following areas (Table 8-6): in closely directing the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty, in requiring teachers to discuss their major classroom problems with them, in having teachers inform the principal about "problem" children in their rooms, and in determining the objectives of the school's guidance program. For every item in the control factor, then, women principals exercise a greater degree of control over the professional activities of their teachers than do the men administrators.

Control over Organizational Policy-making

Up to this point, we have focused on control over the performance of teachers' professional activities. Now we shall explore another dimension of the question of control: the extent to which principals include teachers in the making of important policies about the operation of the school.

We cited earlier Goss' finding about the relationship between type of activity and type of control that occurred among physicians in a hospital: in routine administrative matters, doctors were willing to accept orders from their administrative superiors but in the realm of professional activities, only advice or suggestions were acceptable. These considerations suggest that in deciding policy concerning routine school matters, for example, the scheduling of recess duty or deadlines for reports, the principal may feel it unnecessary to include the staff; and the staff may feel it is unnecessary for them to be included. As

5

the content of decisions becomes more central to teaching and learning activities, we might expect that teachers will be more greatly involved in them.¹⁹ While we would expect this to be a general pattern, our main interest is in determining if there is a sex difference.

Previous studies have shown that "close" supervision by superordinates is usually associated with low delegation of authority to subordinates.²⁰ Consistent with the hypothesis that women principals exercise more control over their teachers' activities than men principals, we expected women principals to include their teachers in policy-making less frequently than men principals.

To examine this facet of the problem of control, we asked the teachers to report the extent ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") to which their principals shared with teachers the responsibility for (1) determining the minimum level of satisfactory student performance in your school; (2) evaluating the job the school is doing; (3) determining how teachers should be supervised; (4) developing a policy for handling problems of the discipline of pupils. Their responses were then given scores from 1 to 5 (high score equals low frequency of sharing), and the teachers replies in each school were averaged to obtain a best estimate of the principal's behavior (Table 8-7).

Of the four items, the women's scores are higher on only two of them; and in only one case (how teachers should be supervised) is there a fairly substantial difference between the performance of the men and women principals. In regard to decisions about designating the minimum level of

Table 8-7. Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Control over Organizational Policy-making

Item	Women			Men		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
How frequently [always (1), almost always (2), occasionally (3), almost never (4), never (5)] does your principal:						
1. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining the minimum level of satisfactory student performance in your school.	2.05	0.54	86	2.06	0.47	89
2. Share with teachers the responsibility for evaluating how good a job the school is doing.	2.01	0.56	86	2.02	0.45	89
3. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining how teachers should be supervised.	3.05	0.64	86	2.85	0.62	89
4. Share with teachers the responsibility for developing a policy for handling student discipline problems.	2.37	0.62	86	2.28	0.54	89

satisfactory performance by the pupils and evaluating the job the school is doing, the means for men and women principals are almost identical (2.05 vs. 2.06 and 2.01 vs. 2.02). Here, according to their teachers, both the men and women in our sample "almost always" include them in policy-making. Both are disposed to involve their teachers a little less frequently in decisions about the disciplining of pupils, the men principals being a little more likely to include teachers than are the women. Only "occasionally" do principals include teachers in making policy about supervisory procedures, women being much less likely to do so than men.

What could account for this? One explanation may be tied to the principals' beliefs about the right of teachers to participate in these four areas. Decisions about policy regarding minimum standards of the pupils' performance and the evaluation of the school's efforts are professional issues in which teachers have a deep concern. Because of the nature of the teaching function and the organization in which teaching is done, policies of the discipline of pupils also vitally affect the teacher's work. On the one hand, discipline is the basic prerequisite of the professional function. On the other, the school is composed of a number of teachers working in their individual classrooms. Disorder in one class is a potential threat to the equilibrium and stability of the entire school. Concerning these three matters the principals may feel deeply obligated to involve teachers in their decisions. But, although teachers undoubtedly also have an interest in how they should be supervised, this is an area of special concern to principals. They may

be less willing to share responsibility with teachers as much in this matter as in the others because this is one of their own major responsibilities. Since the principals were once teachers themselves, they are most likely to be aware of the teachers' norms as to what constitutes "good" and "fair" supervision. Basing judgments on their formal and informal classroom visits and evaluations, they determine the kind and amount of supervision needed by the individual teacher; there is less justification or reason for them to involve teachers in the matter. And on the grounds specified earlier--greater professional competence and self-confidence--women principals are probably much less likely than men to feel it necessary or advisable to include teachers in their decisions in this area.

In summary, the extent to which men and women principals are different or similar in the control they exercise over organizational policy-making seems to depend on the content of the policy. On policy issues closely connected with the core professional activities, men and women principals do not differ in how much they involve teachers. On matters more relevant to their own special responsibilities, they do differ, the women being the less likely to include teachers.

Notes and References for Chapter Eight

1. A. M. Carr-Saunders and P. A. Wilson, The Professions (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1933) and Edward Gross, Work and Society (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1958), pp. 77-83.
2. For a discussion of similarities and differences in professional and bureaucratic standards see Peter M. Blau and W. Richard Scott, Formal Organizations (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), pp. 60-63.
3. Peter M. Blau, The Dynamics of Bureaucracy (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955); Roy G. Francis and Robert C. Stone, Service and Procedure in Bureaucracy: A Case Study (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1956); Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954); and Philip Selznick, TVA and the Grassroots (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949).
4. Gene N. Levine, Natalie Rogoff, and David Caplovitz, "Diversities in Role Conceptions" (Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1955, dittoed); Gene N. Levine, "The Good Physician" (Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1957, mimeographed); and Harold L. Wilensky, Intellectuals in Labor Unions (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1956).
5. Mary E. W. Goss, "Physicians in Bureaucracy: A Case Study of Professional Pressures on Organizational Roles" (unpublished Ph. D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1959).
6. Chester I. Barnard, The Functions of the Executive (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1938), pp. 161-184.

7. Alvin W. Gouldner, Patterns of Industrial Bureaucracy (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1954), pp. 215-228; and Blau, op. cit., pp. 161-179.
8. Goss, op. cit.
9. This statement is based on our observations of elementary schools and data obtained during the interviews with the principals.
10. Goss, op. cit., p. 85.
11. Ibid.
12. For evidence support of this assumption about sex differences in teaching experience, see Chapter Three, Table 3-21.
13. For evidence supporting this assumption, see Chapter Six, Table 6-4.
14. See Appendix C, Table C-16 for item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on Control over Teachers' Professional Activities.
15. See Chapter One, pp. 1-17 -- 1-18 for a consideration of the factor analysis procedures used in the study and other issues related to measuring the principals' performance.
16. See W. E. Parker and R. W. Kleemeier, Human Relations in Supervision (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1951), pp. 250-251; and James C. Worthy, "Organizational Structure and Employee Morale," American Sociological Review, XV (1950), pp. 169-179; and Goss, op. cit.
17. For a discussion of the use of point-biserial correlation as a measure of the relationship between two traits, one of which has only two values and the other which may be scored on a continuous scale, see Helen M. Walker and Joseph Lev, Statistical Inference (New York: Henry

Holt and Co., 1953), pp. 261-267.

18. The scores are based on the weights specified in Table 8-6 and represent the means of the average scores obtained by the men and the women principals on the basis of the reports of the teacher-observers in each school.

19. The fact that the principal is usually a former teacher himself suggests that he would be aware of and sensitive to teachers' expectations concerning the types of decisions in which they should be involved.

20. Nancy C. Morse, Satisfactions in the White-Collar Job (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1953), Chapter X; and Daniel Katz, Nathan Maccoby, and Nancy C. Morse, Productivity, Supervision and Morale in an Office Situation (Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan, 1950), p. 20.

Chapter 9: The Principal and the Relations between Teacher and Pupil

Not always compatible, a principal's responsibilities to his teachers and pupils sometimes place him in perplexing situations. He may expect his staff to give time and effort over and above their classroom work to children who learn with difficulty. But at the same time they may expect him not to saddle them with additional tasks. In case of conflict between teacher and pupils where the teacher is clearly in the wrong, his obligation to support the child may clash with the staff's expectation that he will support the teacher, right or wrong.

With situations of this kind we shall be concerned in this chapter, our interest in them being limited to whether they evoke different behavior in men and women principals. More specifically, we shall focus on two questions: Is there a sex difference in the efforts of men and of women principals to exhort teachers to serve the pupils? Do men and women principals differ in backing the teachers in case of conflict between teacher and pupil?

Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils

Practitioners, be they doctors, lawyers, or teachers, vary in their opinions about exactly what services their clients have a right to expect of them, depending on how they define the professional function. For example, some teachers feel they are responsible only for the intellectual growth of the child but others would include the pupils' social-emotional development. Teachers can be expected to allocate their time and effort according to how they feel about such matters.

Teachers are employed professionals. The regulations of the school system specify the formal length of their work day and in effect establish the minimum time they should devote to their pupils and school activities. But the proportion of teachers who devote only the minimum amount of time and effort to their professional duties will vary from school to school, and it seems reasonable to assume that the principals' own attitude and behavior will influence the quantity and quality of the teachers' service to their pupils. Do the men principals differ from the women in their demands upon their teachers for professional service?

The Hypothesis

Two lines of reasoning led us to the hypothesis that women administrators are more disposed than men to demand maximum service to the pupils from their staffs.

The first was based on the assumptions that in the professional world the effort and time a superior devotes to his own tasks is related to what he expects his subordinates to give to theirs; and since it is more difficult for a woman to achieve an executive position than a man, once she attains the principalship she will devote more time and effort to her work than will a man.¹ From these assumptions it follows that the woman principal will put greater demands for professional service upon the teachers than a man will.

The second line of reasoning begins with the assumption of a sex difference in the emphasis principals place on differences among individual pupils. Those who make much of individual differences are

defining the teachers' functions broadly and in such a fashion as to demand much time and effort. Therefore, the more a principal appreciates the differences among individual pupils, the more devotion and commitment will he expect of the teachers. Since we assumed that women value this aspect of the teacher-pupil relationship more than do men,² we expected the women to make more of service to pupils on the part of teachers than would men.

Testing the Hypothesis

To test the hypothesis, we devised a measure of the principals' demands upon the teachers for professional services based on the responses of the teacher-observers in each school to three questions in the Principals' Role Behavior Instrument which were appropriate to the issue. They were selected on the basis of a factor analysis (See Chapter One) of 16 items dealing with a principal's orientation to the relations between teacher and pupil from which two factors had emerged. The three questions were: "How frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") does your principal [engage in the following kinds of activities] ?":

1. Encourage worthwhile student activities that would require additional work by teachers.
2. Encourage teachers to give extra help in their "free" periods to students needing that help.
3. Put the student's welfare above that of the teacher's when the two are opposed.⁴

To secure the best estimate of the principals' demands upon the teachers

for service, we first computed a score for each teacher-observer based on weights derived from loadings on the factor, and then averaged the teacher-observers' scores in each school to obtain a summary measure of the principals' behavior.

When the mean factor scores of the women and men principals on this index were compared, we found no support for the hypothesis (Table 9-1): although the women did reach a higher mean score than the men (9.24 vs. 9.13), the difference of 0.11 units between them is not statistically significant at below the .05 level.

We then considered circumstances that might affect the relationship between the elementary principals' sex and their demands upon the teachers for service to the pupils, one of which was the socio-economic origins of the pupils. If, as is generally believed, teachers must devote more time and effort to children of lower than to those of higher status to obtain the same results, then we thought that perhaps in schools where the pupils are of lower standing women principals will be more insistent upon the extra effort than will the men.

To learn if this is indeed so, we sorted out the principals in our sample who administered schools in which the average socio-economic status of pupils was relatively low and then computed their mean scores by sex (Table 9-2). We found that the women principals there did obtain a higher score than the men (9.30 vs. 9.04) and the difference of 0.26 was statistically significant at below the .05 level. To explore further the possible influence of the socio-economic status of pupils on the principals' demands on the teachers, we also examined the mean scores of the men and women in schools whose social-class rating was

Table 9-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on
Teacher Service to Pupils

(N = 175)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.24	0.45	86
Men	9.13	0.51	89

* Data unavailable for 14 of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.56; p > .05.$

Table 9-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils by Two Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Proba- bility Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>						
Low	9.30	26	9.04	32	2.06	.05
Middle	9.23	25	9.17	30	0.41	n.s.
High	9.21	35	9.18	27	0.22	n.s.
<u>Mean Teacher Experience</u>						
Short	9.32	29	9.07	29	2.07	.05
Medium	9.18	27	9.05	30	1.02	n.s.
Long	9.21	29	9.26	30	0.40	n.s.

*See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

high or in the middle of our sample. In both types of school the women's mean score was slightly higher than the men's, but neither of the small differences was statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-2).⁵ We conclude then that women principals put more demands on the teachers for service than do the men if theirs are schools of low status, but that there is no difference between them in the case of schools whose body of pupils are of middle or high status.

The teaching experience of the staffs may enter into the question. It may be argued that among principals whose staffs have had relatively little teaching experience, those who most appreciate differences among individual pupils, will be more insistent on the teachers' responsibility to give service to their pupils, in the belief that inexperienced teachers will pay more attention to their directives.

When we examined the mean scores of the women and men whose staffs had had relatively brief teaching experience on our index of their insistence on service from their teachers, we found support for this line of reasoning: the women did obtain a higher score than the men (9.32 vs. 9.07) and the difference of 0.25 was statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-2). We also examined the mean scores of men and women in schools where the teachers' average experience was of the middle length or longer. In schools where the teachers' average experience was of middle length, the mean score of the women was higher than the men's (9.18 vs. 9.05) and in those where it was high the mean score of the men was slightly higher than that of the women (9.26 vs. 9.21). In neither case, however, was the difference in their scores statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-2).⁶

The Principal and Conflict between Teacher and Pupil

Hughes has remarked that "in many of the things which people do for one another, the for can be changed to to by a slight over-doing or by a shift of mood. . . . The danger of major distortion of relationship and function within the framework of a formal office lurks wherever people go or are sent for help or correction. . . ." ⁷ Most principals are doubtless aware that this is the case in teaching when they find themselves arbitrating differences between teacher and pupil.

Elementary principals, however, having once been teachers, know, too, that pupils may easily misinterpret what the teacher says or does. What is done for a child, he may think is being done to him. In telling his parents about "what happened in school today" he may give a distorted account of what the teacher in fact did and fail to understand why she did it. Furthermore, teacher, child, and parents have dissimilar points of view: the teacher may see in a conflict its implications for all the pupils in the classroom whereas the child and his parents may see it only as a personal confrontation. In view of a principal's obligations to protect the rights of both teachers and pupils, the maintaining of the delicate balance between their interests is never simple or easy. The question we now examine is whether men and women principals differ in supporting teachers in cases of conflict with pupils.

The Hypothesis

The hypothesis we tested was that there would be no sex difference among principals in their support of teachers in conflict with

pupils. It was based on the following reasoning:

Although teachers have a professional obligation to do their utmost to facilitate the learning of pupils, they cannot carry out their responsibilities unless the child cooperates. In addition to involving himself actively in learning, the child must accept almost without question the authority of the teacher. What should be taught, how it should be taught, conferring rewards, imposing punishments, and determining such things as seating arrangements are prerogatives of the teacher; and a child or parent who objects to a teacher's decisions is in effect challenging her authority. A principal who does not side with a teacher when such challenges erupt into disputes places her in an embarrassing, even untenable situation. This is the case because the teacher, unlike the physician who sees his patients for short periods of time, must confront all of her pupils simultaneously and work continuously with them every day, month after month. If, because of the principal's failure to give her unqualified support, pupils begin to oppose or scorn her authority, the consequences upon her and her work can be catastrophic. Her judgments may be open to continuous questioning by her pupils and her ability to control the class may be materially impaired. If the principal fails to take her side against a pupil, it looks to the teacher as if she has been betrayed.

It could be argued that women principals might be inclined to support pupils when there is trouble between teacher and pupil more frequently than men because the former give more thought to the social-emotional development of the child.⁸ But we reasoned that the principals'

fear of becoming unpopular with the teachers if they failed to side with them against the pupils would be a greater force in the opposite direction. In short, the null hypothesis was based on the idea that principals as former teachers are inclined to support the teachers; and few of them would jeopardize their relations with the teachers by failing to support them against the pupils, even when the teachers were in the wrong. And although women principals might be disposed to support the pupils more than the men, the undesirable consequences of doing so might be so great as to cause them to act as the men would; hence there would be no sex-linked difference in behavior.

Testing the Hypothesis

Testing the hypothesis required a measure of the extent to which principals supported their teachers when in conflict with pupils. The one we used was derived from the responses of the teacher-observers in each school to four questions on four facets of the principal's possible behavior in situations of this type. A factor analysis of the items touching on the principal's behavior regarding teacher-pupil relations had uncovered two factors, one of which we have earlier considered (Stress Placed on Obtaining Maximum Service for Pupils) and a second which included the four items we used in developing the index of support of teachers in conflict with pupils. The four items to which the teacher-observers responded that were included in this factor were: "How frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") does your principal [engage in the following kinds of activities]?"

1. Side with the teacher when a student complains about the teacher's behavior, even if the student's complaint is legitimate.
2. Support a teacher's discipline decision that the principal believes is grossly unfair to the child.
3. Back the teacher in any public controversy between teacher and student.
4. Insist that students obey teacher's instructions first, and complain about them later.⁹

To obtain the best estimate of the principals' support of teachers in conflict with pupils, we first calculated a score for each teacher-observer based on the weights derived from the loadings on items in the factor and then averaged the teacher-observers' scores in each school to secure a summary measure of the principals' behavior.

When the mean factor scores of the men and women on this measure were compared, we found that although the score of the women was higher than that of the men (10.36 vs. 10.23), the difference of 0.13 was not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-3). The hypothesis that there is no sex difference among principals in their support of teachers in conflict with pupils is confirmed.

Men and women, however, might differ in this respect under certain conditions. It could be maintained that in schools where teachers on the average have had brief experience in teaching the principals would support them in differences with pupils to save the staff from the serious consequences that may be thereby inflicted on them. Because of their

Table 9-3. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils

(N = 175)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	10.36	0.72	86
Men	10.23	0.89	89

* Data unavailable for 14 of the 189 principals.

 $t = 1.08; p > .05.$

greater teaching experience and familiarity with the classroom, the women principals under these circumstances may give greater support to their teachers than will the men.

To put the speculation to the test, we sorted out the principals in our sample the teaching experience of whose staffs was relatively short and then computed the mean scores of the men and women on our index of support of teachers. We found that, contrary to our speculation, the men obtained a higher mean score than the women (10.49 vs. 10.22); however, the difference of 0.27 was not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-4). We also examined the mean scores of the men and women principals the average experience of whose teachers was of medium duration or longer. In both cases, although the women's mean score was higher than the men's, the differences were not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-4).¹⁰

A second condition that might enter in is the socio-economic level of the pupils, averaged for each school. If, as is generally believed, parents of high socio-economic status are as a rule more interested in school affairs and the progress of their children than those of lower, and hence more able and likely to question the acts of the teacher, it could be maintained that women principals would be more disposed to support their teachers than the men in cases of conflict with pupils because they have taught longer and are more able to withstand pressure from parents.

To find out if there was any support for this argument, we sorted out those principals in our sample who were in charge of schools in

Table 9-4. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils by Two Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Proba- bility Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Mean Teacher Experience</u>						
Short	10.22	29	10.49	29	1.18	n.s.
Medium	10.41	27	10.22	30	1.03	n.s.
Long	10.41	29	9.98	30	1.95	n.s.
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>						
Low	10.24	26	10.25	32	0.05	n.s.
Middle	10.27	25	10.32	30	0.22	n.s.
High	10.52	35	10.09	27	2.47	.05

*See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

which the average socio-economic status of the parents was relatively high and then calculated their mean scores by sex. We found that women did indeed give greater backing to teachers who were in conflict with pupils in schools with the highest socio-economic ratings. The mean score for women was 10.52 and for men, 10.09; and the difference of 0.43 is significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-4). In schools with pupils of, on the average, low socio-economic status, the mean scores of the men and women were almost identical (10.25 vs. 10.24); in schools with ratings in the middle range, the men's scores were slightly higher than the women's (10.32 vs. 10.27), but the difference was not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 9-4).¹¹

Notes and References for Chapter Nine

1. See Chapter Eight, Table 8-4, for evidence supporting this assumption.
2. See Chapter Five, Table 5-1, for evidence in support of this assumption.
3. We designated the first factor, Stress Placed on Obtaining Maximum Service for Pupils, and the second one, Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils. The principals' performance on an index reflecting the second factor will be considered later in the chapter.
4. See Appendix C, Table C-17, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on Stress Placed on Obtaining Maximum Service for Pupils.
5. All statements about the probability levels under the three socio-economic level categories in Table 9-2 are based on a two-tailed test of significance.
6. All statements about the probability levels under the three mean teacher experience categories in Table 9-2 are based on a two-tailed test of significance.
7. Everett C. Hughes, Men and Their Work (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 70.
8. For evidence supporting this, see Chapter Five, Table 5-7.
9. See Appendix C, Table C-18, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils.
10. All statements about the probability levels under the three

mean teacher experience categories in Table 9-4 are based on a two-tailed test of significance.

11. All statements about the probability levels under the three socio-economic level categories in Table 9-4 are based on a two-tailed test of significance.

Chapter 10: Social Distance

Weber's classic model of bureaucracy stressed formal distinctions of status among members of an organization and social distance in their relationships to promote their impartiality and efficiency.¹ In work situations where superordinates and their subordinates are members of the same profession, however, such a view of organizations is not compatible with the idea that members of the same profession are expected to associate with each other on a collegial basis or as a "company of equals."² The relationship between the principal and the teacher is, of course, that of superior and subordinate; and, therefore, following Weber's conception of an organization, it might be anticipated that it is one of distance, not nearness.³ But to the extent that principals and teachers are, at the same time, professional colleagues, one looks for closeness and a fair measure of professional equality, not distance. Inside the school, how do principals conduct themselves vis à vis their teachers? We undertook to find out whether male principals differ from females in the social distance they maintain between themselves and their teachers.

Parsons has noted that "the concept of 'closeness' of social relationship is not a simple one"⁴ and one of its complexities may be that the social distance between a superordinate and his subordinates may vary according to context. In the case of schools it may be of one magnitude inside the school building and another on the outside. Accordingly, in this chapter, we examine the social distance separating men and women school principals from their teachers in both types of situations.

Social Distance in the School

In considering the concept of social distance, Simmel noted:

. . .it is hard to reconcile personal relations, which are the very life principle of small groups, with the distance and coolness of objective and abstract norms without which the large group cannot exist.⁵

This dualism of nearness and distance is necessary for our behavior to be consistently correct. It inheres, so to speak, in the fundamental forms and problems of our life.⁶

Simmel maintained that social nearness leads to knowledge and understanding; social distance to objectivity and detachment--all qualities which are necessary to the interaction of principal and teacher. Though subordinates the teachers, as professionals who have passed through much the same educational experiences as the principals and who share with them the norms and values of their calling, look to the principal for a sympathetic understanding of their problems in the classroom. On the other hand, the principals occupy a different and higher place in the hierarchical structure and from time to time may have to discipline the teachers under them. They must also evaluate the teachers for purposes of recommending tenure or promotion. Studies of leadership show as Kadushin puts it, that "too high a felt social proximity between leader and follower leads to too high an emotional involvement with the group and a reduced efficiency."⁷ He interprets the lessened efficiency as being caused by the leader's unwillingness or inability to exert his power.⁸

This, we may suppose, is exactly what may take place between the principal and his teachers.

A characteristic of the elementary school which makes the social distance between principal and teacher a problem is its size. The historic ideal of the elementary school as a neighborhood institution has kept it, as a rule, much smaller than the typical junior or senior high school. But this introduces dilemmas: the smaller the school the greater the difficulty in maintaining the optimum social distance--whatever that may happen to be.

The Hypothesis

Of the men and the women principals, which maintains the greater social distance between themselves and their teachers inside the school? Our hypothesis was that the men would be more distant in their bearing towards teachers than women. We arrived at it by way of four lines of reasoning, three of which lead to the prediction.

First, we reasoned that the higher an individual aspires, the greater his interest in occupational advancement and the more will he insist on recognition of the status accruing to his present position and, at the same time, on distinctions of status between himself and subordinates, from whom he is apt to keep at a distance. If we assume further that the men among the principals generally aspire higher than the women (a fact we established earlier; see Table 4-1), then it follows that they will maintain the greater social distance between themselves and their teachers.

For a principal to permit social nearness to his teachers while

he is at the same time responsible for disciplining them when necessary and for passing professional judgment on them, calls for confidence in his own competence to direct instruction. Being close to teachers means that he and they will know each other better, professionally and personally: each can assess the other more accurately than might otherwise be possible. In this situation, where familiarity may breed contempt, we assumed that the principal with the greater self-confidence when directing instruction is likely to be the closer to his colleague-subordinates. Then, if we assume that men principals in general set a lower value on their professional abilities than women,⁹ they should also be likely to keep their staffs at a greater social distance.

A third line of reasoning concerned the differential effect on social distance of interaction as between members of the same and of the opposite sex. It has been observed: ". . .in most strata men and women in each other's presence talk conventionally, act more formally, than in groups of one's sex, and the conventions influence the style as well as the amount and content of expression."¹⁰ This will hold true, we assumed, even when the interaction occurs between two individuals on different levels in a hierarchical structure, since of all training that in sex roles is the most exigent.¹¹ Since the great majority of elementary school teachers are women, it follows, obviously, that women principals generally associate with members of the same sex and men principals with members of the opposite sex in their schools. The men principals, then, should maintain greater social distance between themselves and their subordinates than would the women.

In addition to the effect of the sex of the individuals, the consequences of their ages upon the social distance between them must be considered. We assume that interaction between old and young differs from that between people of the same age: the greater the disparity in age the greater the deference and the distance. Assuming that the women principals on the average are older than the men,¹² and that principals generally are older than most of their teachers,¹³ we expected to find greater social distance between the women administrators and their teachers than between the men and theirs. But while age undoubtedly has an effect upon social distance, we feel its influence is outweighed by that of sex. Therefore, since three other arguments brought us to the hypothesis that men principals maintain greater social distance from their teachers than women, that is the hypothesis we shall test.

Testing the Hypothesis

Testing the hypothesis required an index of the social distance in the school between principals and their teachers. Such a measure was developed from the responses of the teacher-observers in each school to four questions in the Principals' Role Questionnaire. The four were selected on the basis of a factor analysis of 15 items which focused on the subject of social distance. The factor analysis revealed two factors, one of which included the four items used in the index of Social Distance in the School and the second, which contained the five items to be used in the measure of Social Distance Outside the School, to be discussed later in this chapter. The four items in the first factor were: "How frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally,"

"almost never," "never") does your principal [engage in the following kinds of activities]?"

1. Discourage teachers from treating him as "one of the gang" at informal gatherings of teachers.
2. Encourage all teachers to call him by his first name when students are not present.
3. Make it a practice to have lunch frequently with the teachers in his school.
4. Insist, tactfully, that teachers show due respect for his position as principal.¹⁴

To obtain the best estimate of the social distance between the principal and his teachers inside the school, we first computed a score for each teacher based on the weights derived from the loadings of items included in the factor. The teacher-observer scores in each school were then averaged to secure a summary measure of their principal's behavior.

When the mean scores of the women and men principals in the sample were compared, we found that the hypothesis was not supported: the women made only a slightly higher score than the men (9.16 vs. 9.15) and the difference of 0.01 units is not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 10-1). Rather, the behavior of men and women principals appears much alike.

In view of their almost identical mean scores, we would not expect great variation between the men and women principals, even under different conditions. But since this must be empirically determined, we

Table 10-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance in the School

(N = 175)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.16	1.00	86
Men	9.15	0.88	89

* Data unavailable for 14 of the 189 principals.

 $t = 0.06; p > .05.$

decided, in view of our earlier comments about its probable importance, to inquire into the effect of the mean age of the teaching staff on the social distance between the principal and his teachers. Therefore, we classified the principals into three groups on the basis of the average age of the teachers in their school and then computed their mean scores by sex (Table 10-2). In the young and middle groups, as classified by mean teacher age, the mean scores of men principals were higher than those of women, but the differences were not statistically significant at below the .05 level. In schools where the teachers were relatively old, women principals maintained greater social distance than the men but the difference was also not statistically significant.¹⁵ It is of interest to note that for our sample, among women principals, the highest scores on social distance occur among the teachers of middle and older mean age; there the scores are approximately the same. Their lowest score was in schools where the staff was, on the average, young. Among men principals, the greatest social distance was in the group middle in age, the schools where the average of the teaching staff was young or old having roughly similar scores. For both men and women principals, the highest score on social distance was in those schools where the mean age of teachers was middle or intermediate.

Further Analyses

What do the responses of the teacher-observers to each of the items included in the index of Social Distance in the School reveal about the social distance between men and women principals and their staffs?

First, we note that as to three of the four questions, the behavior of

Table 10-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance in the School by Mean Teacher Age

Subclassification*	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Probability Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>						
Young	9.00	31	9.05	27	0.23	n.s.
Middle	9.26	31	7.44	27	0.74	n.s.
Old	9.24	24	9.00	35	1.01	n.s.

*See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

men and women principals is highly similar (Table 10-3).

Principals, both men and women, "almost always," or "occasionally" insist that teachers show due respect for their position (Item 4). That principals are not thought of as more uncompromising may be due to the teacher-observers' interpretation of the wording of the question, that is, whether it meant that the principal insists on respect through tactful gestures or insists on it verbally. The latter would probably be an infrequent or occasional occurrence.

On the average, men and women administrators "occasionally" eat luncheon with their teachers (Item 3). "Occasionally," or "almost never," do they discourage teachers from treating them as "one of the gang" at the teachers' informal gatherings (Item 1). The important word here seems to be "informal." This finding is not inconsistent with the one just described, since the context of the interaction between principal and teacher, that is, whether it be a formal or informal occasion, probably influences the principal's behavior.

According to the teacher-observers, there are differences between men and women in their encouraging teachers to call them by their first names when students are not present (Item 2). On the average, the men principals "almost never" do so, while women in general are somewhat more likely to do it. The difference may reflect the typical modes of cross-sex and same-sex behavior to which we earlier referred.

Table 10-3. Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance in the School

Item*	Women			Men		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:						
1. Discourage teachers from treating his as "one of the gang" at informal gatherings of teachers.	2.40	0.69	86	2.30	0.64	89
2. Encourage all teachers to call him by his first name, when students are not present.	2.40	1.09	86	1.87	1.02	89
3. Make it a practice to have lunch frequently with the teachers in his school.	3.14	0.91	86	3.13	0.86	89
4. Insist, tactfully, that teachers show due respect for his position as principal.	3.50	0.71	86	3.47	0.68	89

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Social Distance Outside the School

In what ways is social distance between the principal and his teachers outside the school a problem? Principals and teachers being members of the same profession even though their positions within it differ, their bearing to each other outside the school, it seems, should be determined more on personal grounds than by professional circumstances. However, their behavior toward each other outside the school may affect their behavior within. (Of course, social interaction varies as to kind and intensity and that conditions its effect on interaction in other contexts: it may range from the association between guests at the same parties, members of the same informal groups or formal organizations, or close personal friends.) As Hughes points out, "If some group of people continues to act together, even with regard to a secular matter, claims are likely to develop."¹⁶ Even in business matters, moral and personal claims may grow up among individuals. Extramural interaction between the principal and his teachers may give rise to claims by one party upon the other. Particularistic considerations could supercede the universalistic and threaten the principal's impartiality in school affairs.

In this section, we ask: do men and women principals differ as to the social distance between them and their staffs outside the school?

The Hypothesis

Five arguments were considered in developing the hypothesis that the men administrators would maintain greater social distance in their association with teachers outside the school than would the women.

The first concerned the effect of the principal's assessment of his own skill in personal relationships on what social distance he will insist on. Association with teachers outside of the school can create a delicate situation for him. True, he may come to know and understand his teachers better, but it may cost him the objectivity and detachment that are necessary if he is to be an impartial administrator. And of course their association outside the school may tempt a teacher to put claims on the principal intramurally. We reasoned that the more confidence a principal has in his skill in dealing with people, the less likely is he to insist on a certain distance separating him from his teachers, outside the school. If we assume that the men principals set a lower value on their social skills than the women principals set on theirs,¹⁷ it follows that they would maintain greater social distance between themselves and their teachers in extramural situations than would the women.

A second idea leading to the hypothesis had to do with our expecting men to aspire higher than women and consequently to set themselves further apart from their teachers. The ambitious individual, one may assume, will strive toward higher status and will be committed to mobility. But the mobile man must be ready to sever ties and endure the inevitable nostalgia or regret and often, as well, resentment of those he is leaving. Therefore we thought it reasonable to assume that an ambitious individual is more likely to confine his social intercourse with work associates to office hours than would one who aspires lower. If so, the ambitious principal will see that his or her extramural

contacts with teachers are the more distant and formal. Assuming that the men principals generally aspire higher than the women,¹⁸ it follows that they will insist on greater social distance between themselves and their teachers in their associations outside the school than would the women.

Our third reason was the difference in the marital status of the men and the women principals: on the whole, the former are married; the latter are single. Unmarried principals will more probably have the time and the inclination to pass time with teachers after school hours, since, obviously, they have fewer competing ties and fewer demands upon their time and attention; moreover the unmarried may have more money to spend on pastimes and diversions. In our sample 92 per cent of the male principals are married; in contrast, 63 per cent of the women are single. So, if our reasoning is correct, men administrators should maintain greater distance between themselves and their staffs outside the school than would the women.

A fourth argument brings the customary modes and conditions of interaction between men and women to bear on our inquiry. Specifically, in cross-sex interaction there is greater social distance than when the parties are of the same sex. Caplow has pointed out that in most mixed groups of workers, almost inevitably sexual or quasi-sexual relationships will arise which may occasion conflict. This, he adds, "...by arousing the interest and sometimes the intervention of outsiders, including wives and husbands. . .poses an additional threat and disturbs the carefully guarded separation between home and work which figures

so largely in the psychic economy of the modern breadwinner."¹⁹ Just to avoid these complications, we would expect that most men and women observe the convention of greater distance in cross-sex than in same-sex encounters. And since most elementary school teachers are women, it follows that men principals are more distant towards their teachers outside the school than are women principals.

Finally, we posited that the greater the difference in age between two people, the greater the formality and deference of younger to older. If we further assume that most teachers in an elementary school are younger than the principal, and that women principals are older on the average than men principals, then there should be greater social distance between women principals and their staffs than between men administrators and theirs. But we are thereby led to a prediction contrary to that which issued from the other four arguments. To this we would say that the mores are more stringent when it comes to interaction between sexes than between ages, and so sex would be a more powerful variable than age in its influence on social distance.

Since four of five arguments lead to the hypothesis that men principals will keep at a greater social distance from their teachers, outside the school, than women, this, then, is the hypothesis to be tested.

Testing the Hypothesis

To test the hypothesis, we used the teacher-observers' responses to the five questions included in the second factor which emerged from a factor analysis of the 15 items concerned with the social distance between principal and teachers in situations mentioned earlier. The

five questions were: "How frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") does your principal [engage in the following kinds of activities]?"

1. Discourage social invitations from faculty members.
2. Avoid social involvement with groups of teachers.
3. Refrain from joining a social club to which a number of his teachers belong.
4. Follow the policy of not having members of the faculty as close personal friends.
5. Spend an occasional evening with faculty members.²⁰

To obtain the best estimate of the social distance between principal and teachers outside the school we first computed a score for each teacher-observer based on the weights derived from the loadings of the items included in the factor and then averaged the scores of the teacher-observers in each school to secure a summary measure of their principal's behavior.

The mean scores of the men and women support the hypothesis: the men's score is higher than the women's (10.34 vs. 9.87) and the difference of 0.47 is statistically significant at below the .01 level (Table 10-4). There is greater social distance between the men principals and their staffs outside the school than there is between the women and theirs.

Until now, when we have found support for a hypothesis, we have asked whether the demonstrated relationship might not perhaps be due to the confounding influence of a third variable and among third variables

Table 10-4. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance
Outside the School

(N = 175)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	9.87	1.29	86
Men	10.34	1.15	89

* Data unavailable for 14 of the 189 principals.

$t = 2.56$; $p < .01$.

we considered age and marital status. But in the present instance, the logic of the case required that these two variables be included as part of the reasoning; hence we need not open the question of artifact with regard to them.

To what extent does the relationship continue to exist under various subclassifications of the data? We subclassified the data by region, socio-economic level of school, size of city, size of school, and mean age of the teaching staff; and when we examined the relationship between sex and social distance outside the school under these five conditions, we see that in all 16 sub-groupings of the data the men score higher than the women (Table 10-5). The consistency of the analyses is noteworthy and increases our confidence in the original finding.

Testing the Reasoning

We postulated that four intervening variables, self-evaluation of skill in personal relationships, aspiration, marital status, and sex mores, link sex to the social distance between principal and teachers in extramural encounters. Briefly, the reasoning was: (1) if the male principals value their own skill in dealing with people less highly than the women value theirs and if this self-evaluation is negatively related to social distance, then men principals will be more socially distant from teachers than women. (2) If men administrators aspire higher than women and if this is positively related to social distance, then the men principals will display greater social distance in relations with their teachers than will the women. (3) If more men than

Table 10-5. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance
Outside the School by Five
Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	9.28	0.67	10	9.72	0.92	17	+
Midwest	10.16	1.73	26	10.58	0.97	27	+
East	10.00	1.13	32	10.77	1.28	17	+
South	9.53	0.82	18	10.24	1.16	28	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	9.70	1.08	45	10.11	1.12	46	+
Medium	9.99	1.25	29	10.60	1.18	27	+
Large	10.21	1.89	12	10.59	0.99	16	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.07	1.51	26	10.70	1.11	32	+
Middle	9.76	1.07	25	10.07	1.19	30	+
High	9.80	1.25	35	10.24	1.03	27	+
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>							
Low	9.89	1.42	31	10.48	0.99	27	+
Middle	9.82	1.20	31	10.07	1.13	27	+
High	9.91	1.23	24	10.46	1.23	35	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	9.84	1.19	30	10.17	1.28	20	+
Medium	9.57	1.05	35	10.17	1.04	25	+
Large	10.40	1.60	21	10.58	1.08	38	+

women principals are married and if being married is positively related to social distance between principal and teachers outside the school, then the men will maintain greater social distance than the women.

(4) If it is in the mores to keep at greater distance in cross-sex than in same-sex encounters, then, since elementary school principals deal with predominantly female staffs, the men among them will insist on greater social distance from their teachers than will the women.

We tested the reasoning by the same procedure used before. The first step is to determine if each intervening variable is related to both the independent variable (sex) and the dependent variable (social distance) in the assumed way. If these relationships do not occur, then the assumptions behind the hypothesis are not tenable.

The data necessary to test the association between the intervening and the independent and the dependent variables are presented in Table 10-6.²¹ Neither of the relationships required for self-evaluation of skill in personal relations to be considered an intervening variable exist and only one of the necessary relationships is found to justify calling aspiration an intervening variable: the former is not associated with sex or social distance, while the latter is related to sex but not to social distance at below the .05 level of statistical significance. With regard to marital status, the fact that men principals are much more likely to be married than women appears again, and marital status (marriedness) is revealed to be associated with social distance, as assumed. In sum, then, the assumed linkage of only one intervening variable, marital status, is empirically established.

Table 10-6. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Social Distance Outside the School)

(N = 175)

Assumed Intervening Variable	Sex [#] (Point-biserial <u>r</u>)	Social Distance Outside School (Pearsonian <u>r</u>)
Self-evaluation of interpersonal skills	.11	-.06
Level of aspiration	-.38*	.11
Marital status (marriedness)	-.66*	.20*

Female = 1; male = 0.

* $p < .05$.

Does the relationship between the sex of principals and their social distance drop when marital status is held constant? The zero-order point-biserial correlation between sex and social distance is $-.19$. When marital status is held constant, the relationship drops to $-.10$ (Table 10-7). This finding points to the possibility that marital status may operate as an explanatory variable, though not accounting completely for the relationship between sex and social distance.

Further Analyses

The responses of the teacher-observers to the individual items may illuminate additional aspects of the question of the social distance between men and women principals and their teachers outside the school. The five items describe social encounters with teachers involving different degrees of distance: invitations to the same parties, membership in groups, close personal friendship (Table 10-8).

Three of the five items deal with social involvement. In general, principals "occasionally" avoid social involvement with groups of teachers, although men are more likely to do so than women (Item 2). While men and women principals on the average spend an evening "occasionally" with faculty members, the men are the less likely to do so (Item 5). Finally, principals in general "occasionally" or "almost never" discourage social invitations from faculty members; here again, men are more likely to be discouraging than are the women (Item 1). On each of these items, then, there are differences between the behavior of men and of women principals, the former tending to be the more distant from their teachers.

Table 10-7. Zero-order and First-order Partial Correlation Coefficients
of Sex and Social Distance Outside the School

(N = 175)

	Zero- order I	First- order Partial I
Sex and Social Distance Outside the School	-.19	
<u>Holding constant:</u>		
Marital status (marriedness)		-.10

Table 10-8. Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Social Distance Outside the School

Item*	Women			Men		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:						
1. Discourage social invitations from faculty members.	2.44	1.04	86	2.71	1.07	89
2. Avoid social involvement with groups of teachers.	2.65	0.60	86	2.91	0.52	89
3. Refrain from joining a social club to which a number of his teachers belong.	2.54	0.68	86	2.54	0.61	89
4. Follow the policy of not having members of the faculty as close personal friends.	2.87	0.54	86	2.89	0.57	89
5. Spend an occasional evening with faculty members.	3.04	0.59	86	2.65	0.54	89

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

According to the teacher-observers' reports the men and women administrators do not differ on the average in refraining from joining a social club to which a number of their teachers belong: both men and women do so only "occasionally" or "almost never" (Item 3). They also do not differ with respect to having members of the faculty as close personal friends: the men and women in general follow this policy only "occasionally" (Item 4).

Two things stand out about these findings. First, the sex differences occur in the three items classified as having to do with social involvement: men and women principals were similar in their behavior relative to group or club membership and personal friendships with teachers. Second, the teacher-observers' responses to all the items about social distance outside the school cluster around the category, "occasionally," with minor variability. This suggests that the social distance maintained by principals outside school may be somewhat conditional on other circumstances, such as just which teachers or clubs or activities are involved, the principal's total relationship with the teaching staff and the like.

Since men principals keep in general at a greater social distance from their teachers outside school, the situations in which they may associate with their staffs vary. The findings indicate, in short, that in certain areas men and women principals may act alike but in others they differ.

Notes and References for Chapter Ten

1. Max Weber, The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, trans. A. M. Henderson and Talcott Parsons, ed. Talcott Parsons (New York: Oxford University Press, 1947), pp. 329-334.
2. For an analysis of four dimensions subsumed under the concept of social distance, see Charles Kadushin, "Social Distance between Client and Professional," American Journal of Sociology, LXVII (1962), pp. 517-531. For a recent study of the relationship between status distance and personal distance in a different type of situation, see Leonard I. Pearlin and Morris Rosenberg, "Nurse-Patient Social Distance and the Structural Context of a Mental Hospital," American Sociological Review, XXVII (1962), pp. 56-65.
3. See Weber, op. cit.
4. Talcott Parsons, The Social System (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1951), p. 279.
5. Kurt H. Wolff (Ed.), The Sociology of Georg Simmel (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1950), p. 97.
6. ibid.
7. Fred E. Fiedler, "A Note on Leadership Theory: The Effect of Social Barriers between Leaders and Followers," Sociometry (1957), pp. 87-94; cited in Kadushin, op. cit.
8. Kadushin, op. cit., p. 329.
9. For evidence supporting this assumption, see Chapter Six, Table 6-4.

10. Mark Benney, David Riesman, and Shirley A. Star, "Age and Sex in the Interview," American Journal of Sociology, LXII (1956), p. 144.
11. Ibid.
12. For evidence supporting this assumption, see Chapter Two, Table 2-1.
13. See Appendix A for data bearing on this assumption.
14. See Appendix C, Table C-19, for item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the principals' scores on Social Distance in the School.
15. All tests of significance used in Table 10-2 are based on two-tailed tests.
16. Everett C. Hughes, "Institutions," in Alfred M. Lee (Ed.), Principles of Sociology (New York: Barnes and Noble, Inc., 1951), p. 232.
17. Evidence presented later in the chapter, Table 10-6, indicates that this is a tenuous assumption.
18. For evidence supporting this assumption, see Chapter Four, Table 4-1.
19. Theodore Caplow, The Sociology of Work (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1957), p. 437.
20. See Appendix C, Table C-20, for item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing principals' scores on Social Distance Outside the School.
21. Since our data provide no basis to examine the fourth line of reasoning involving the sex scores, the intervening variable analyses deal with only three of the assumed intervening variables.

Chapter 11: Parental Involvement in the School

What the "proper" relationship of parents to the school should be has long been a controversial subject. A basic issue confronting school administrators is whether parents, as well as pupils, are the school's clients.

Part of the difficulty in resolving the issue is caused by the different stances parents adopt toward the school: as adults responsible for the welfare of their children, as alumni, or as citizens who pay for public education and elect school boards¹ which establish the general policies and delegate authority to the professional educators. Another facet of the problem is created by the extreme youth of pupils who, in the elementary school, typically range from 6 - 14 years of age. They are not yet socialized to adult behavior, nor are they fully equipped to know or to look after their own interests. It is impossible for them to be certain of their rights and to judge the professional services they receive.² The law recognizes these and other age-related conditions in declaring children minors and protecting their interests accordingly. Thus doctors, for example, must obtain the written approval of parents before performing surgical operations on children. The school must secure parental permission before children can be taken on school trips or placed in special programs. The P.T.A. and similar organizations connected with most elementary schools attest to the school's recognition of the rights of parents to be informed.

If the child is the school's immediate client, we might say that parents are its remote ones. This is the case not only in education, but in nearly all professions which deal with children. In a study of

medical students, for example, it is reported that their stereotype of pediatrics ". . .contains a strong suggestion that the patient relationships will be unsatisfactory because of the difficulty of communicating with children and dealing with their parents."³ To the medical profession, parents are apparently necessary, but not always helpful, participants in the professional-child client relationship. In the elementary school the issue is not whether parents have a right to be concerned about the progress and well-being of their children, but over the extent and the nature of their participation.

Why should the involvement of parents in school affairs offer a potential problem to teachers and administrators? Like other professionals, they claim a mandate to define public values in their area of specialized training, an area vital to the welfare of society, the education of children, and to specify the conduct appropriate for laymen in matters connected with their work.⁴ The participation of parents in deliberations about school objectives or methods of teaching could lead to their challenging the mandate of the professionals.

Lay interference in the more established professions such as medicine or law is restricted largely by the esoteric nature of the knowledge and skills of their practitioners: the layman has neither the background nor the experience to judge the services he receives. In the elementary school the situation is different and herein lies part of the teachers' dilemma. Teachers in the primary grades claim a mandate to transmit knowledge and skills that are in the realm more of the familiar than the esoteric, so that parents the more readily can pass

judgment on their activities.⁵ In addition, the higher level of education of present-day parents may result in more questioning or challenging of the work of the schools.

Another circumstance exacerbates the issue of parental participation: unlike the junior or senior high school, the elementary school is a neighborhood institution, geographically and psychologically.⁶ Proximity makes it more sensitive to neighborhood problems. Local tensions outside the school are more likely to be felt within and may impinge on the parents' involvement and on school affairs.

Such circumstances make the parents' involvement an especially troublesome issue to the principal since he is responsible for the operation of the school and is its representative. In addition, while most teachers deal with a parent primarily as the mother or father of a particular child in their classrooms, a principal must also deal with parents as a collectivity, for example, at P.T.A. meetings.

Confronting the elementary principal, then, is the question: to what extent should he involve parents in school affairs? As we have seen the issue is complex: on the one hand, because his organization educates young children, the principal cannot ignore the fact that parents are its remote clients. On the other hand, he and his teachers as professionals claim to be experts in imparting skills and knowledge to young children and the involvement of laymen can interfere with their work. Given this situation, the principal must select among alternative courses of behavior: he may severely restrict the parents' participation in most school activities; he may encourage it in nearly all of

them; or he may permit it in some and discourage it in others. If he chooses the second or third alternatives, he may co-opt parents into the organization as members of advisory committees or as part-time helpers and thereby may hope to bring about in them a greater understanding and appreciation of its problems.⁷ Such a strategy may forestall disputes and relieve tensions between parents and the school. There are limits, of course, to this approach but the permissible range is fairly wide, depending in part on the attitude of the higher administration of the school system toward parents.

With this background, we turn to our special interest in the issue of parent-school relationships: is there a sex difference among elementary school principals in the extent to which they permit parents to be involved in school affairs?

The Hypothesis

Our hypothesis was that women principals involve parents more in school affairs than do men. It was based on the following considerations:

In the first place, we reasoned that women principals would feel less threatened by the parents' participation than men. Elementary school teaching, we have pointed out, lacks the mystique associated with other professions, such as medicine and law. How then can teachers and their principals justify to parents their claim to be experts? In contrast to lawyers and doctors, they can point to only a limited body of formal or technical knowledge. Rather they must base their claim primarily on informal knowledge based on practical experience: what they

have seen and done that "works" or does not "work" in learning and teaching. It seems reasonable to assume that the principals who are more able to cope with the practices and programs of the school will feel less threatened by laymen's questioning and hence will be less inclined to reduce the parents' involvement in school affairs. If we further assume that the extent of the principals' elementary teaching experience is positively related to their accumulation of pragmatic knowledge about teaching and learning and, in addition, assume that women administrators have had, on the average, more of elementary teaching experience than men,⁸ it follows that women in the principalship would encourage participation by parents in school affairs more than would men.

In the second place we assumed that principals who place a higher value on their own ability to direct instruction would encourage greater participation of parents in school affairs than those whose self-evaluation was lower. They would feel more capable of meeting and answering parents' questions and reservations about teachers and about school practices. If we further assume that women would judge themselves more favorably than men in the evaluation of their own ability to manage the instructional program,⁹ then we would expect women principals to encourage the parents to involve themselves in school activities more than would men.

In the third place, we expected a sex difference in the principals' willingness to involve parents in the school since we assumed that women would evaluate their skills in relating to other persons more highly than men. In any profession, be it medicine, law, or education, there

are always individuals who possess the highest of professional qualifications but who are unable to make the best use of them because they do not know how to deal with clients. In administering their schools, principals are of necessity in frequent contact with parents and so their opinion of their interpersonal skills could exert an effect on the involvement they encourage in the parents: those with a relatively low regard for their skills in human relations could be expected to avoid or try to avoid potentially threatening situations, such as working with parent committees, more than those with a higher opinion of their own ability to cope with people. And, since we assumed that female school executives would evaluate their skills in dealing with people more highly than the males, we anticipate that schools administered by women would be characterized by greater involvement of parents than those supervised by men.

Finally, we expected to find a sex difference among the elementary principals in this matter because we thought women would place greater emphasis on the social-emotional development of pupils than men and that this difference would result in their encouraging parents to participate in school affairs more than men. Our reasoning was as follows: the more a principal stresses the social and emotional development of pupils in his school, knowing the parents' vital role in it, the more necessary will he feel it to work closely with them. And since we assumed that women would place greater emphasis on this aspect of their pupils' development than men,¹⁰ we expected that women principals would encourage greater participation of the parents than would the men.

Testing the Hypothesis

To test the hypothesis, we devised a measure of the principals' involvement of parents in school affairs based on the responses of the teacher-observers in each school to six questions in the Principals' Role Behavior Instrument, each of which concerned how much their administrators encouraged parents to participate in various school activities. A factor analysis of 16 items that focused on the principals' behavior in dealing with parents had uncovered two factors, one of which included the six items we used in constructing the index of Involvement of Parents in School Affairs.¹¹ The six items to which the teachers responded included in this factor were: "How frequently ("always," "almost always," "occasionally," "almost never," "never") does your principal [engage in the following kinds of activities]?"

- (1) Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.
- (2) Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."
- (3) Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.
- (4) Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.
- (5) Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.
- (6) Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.¹²

To obtain the best estimate of the degree to which principals involve parents in the schools' activities, we first computed a score for

each teacher-observer based on weights derived from loadings on the factor, and then averaged the teacher-observer scores in each school to obtain a summary measure of the principals' behavior.

When the scores of principals in our sample were tabulated by sex on the Index of Parental Involvement, we found that the men, not the women as we had predicted, had the higher mean score (7.69 vs. 7.63; high score reflects high parent involvement), but that the small difference of 0.06 was not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 11-1).¹³ The finding, in short, reveals no support for our hypothesis that women in the principalship involve parents more in school activities than do the men.

This led us to consider conditions in the work of elementary school administrators that might have a bearing on the association between their sex and their encouragement of parents to participate in school affairs. One circumstance might be the parents' socio-economic status. It is generally believed that parents of high socio-economic status are more interested in their children's educational and social-emotional development than those of lower status. If this is indeed true and if principals in schools with pupils lower in status generally believe that some degree of parental involvement is educationally beneficial to their pupils, then those school administrators who feel more capable of working with lower-class parents because of their professional competence and interpersonal skills could be expected to involve them more than the ones with a lower opinion of their capacity to cope with such parents. And if we further assume that women on the average assess

Table 11-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Parental Involvement
(N = 175)*

Sex	Mean	S.D.	N
Women	7.63	1.40	86
Men	7.69	1.26	89

* Data unavailable for 14 of the 189 principals.

$t = 0.50; p > .05.$

more highly than men their professional competence and their interpersonal skills, we might find that women in schools with pupils of lower status tend to involve parents more than men.

To determine whether the data supported the reasoning, we sorted out those principals in our sample who administered schools in which the average socio-economic status of the parents of their pupils was relatively low and then calculated their mean scores by sex on Parental Involvement. We found that women did obtain a higher score than the men (7.57 vs. 7.12) in the schools with the lowest socio-economic clientele but that the difference of 0.43 was not large enough to claim statistical significance at below the .05 level (Table 11-2). To explore further the possible influence of the socio-economic status of parents on the extent to which men and women principals involve them in school activities, we also examined the mean scores of the men and women principals located in schools whose class rating was middle or high for our sample. We found that in those schools with the highest socio-economic rating the men obtained scores on Parental Involvement that were considerably greater than those of the women (8.34 vs. 7.75) and that the difference of 0.59 was almost but not quite large enough to be considered statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 11-2).¹⁴ For the schools with a middle socio-economic rating, the finding was that the men also had a higher mean score on parental involvement than the women (7.70 vs. 7.51) but that the difference in this case, too, was not statistically significant.

Another interesting finding is revealed (Table 11-2) when we observe the influence of the socio-economic status of parents on men and

Table 11-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Parental Involvement by Socio-economic Level of Student Body

Subclassification*	Women		Men		t	Probability Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Socio-economic level</u>						
Low	7.57	26	7.12	32	1.19	n.s.
Middle	7.51	25	7.70	30	0.57	n.s.
High	7.75	35	8.34	27	1.94	n.s.

*See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

women principals separately: the men tend to encourage parents to participate in the affairs of their schools increasingly as their socio-economic status rises; but among the women although they, too, tend to involve parents most when the social status of parents is relatively high, there is little difference in their scores on parental involvement when they administer schools where the parents' average socio-economic status is middle or low.

Further Analysis

Additional light may be shed on the question of principals' involvement of parents and sex differences in it by looking at the behavior of the men and women on the items included in the Index of Parental Involvement (Table 11-3).

In what school activities do both men and women principals encourage parental participation? According to the teacher-observer reports, the one in which they most frequently encourage it is a highly passive type of involvement: attendance at school assemblies (Item 6, Table 11-3). Next comes the services of parents on school trips or class projects (Item 3). This, too, is a fairly restricted form of participation, and like attending school assemblies, one which can be carefully defined and easily regulated.

What parent participation do both the men and women principals almost always discourage? The two services most closed to parents, according to the teachers' reports, are the developing of the course of study and their use as teacher helpers (Items 4 and 2). Principals also apparently only infrequently call on parents to consider the educational

Table 11-3. Item Means of Women and Men Principals on Parental Involvement

Item*	Women			Men		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:						
1. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.	2.21	0.64	86	2.26	0.48	89
2. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."	1.95	0.70	86	2.02	0.67	89
3. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.	3.47	0.65	86	3.46	0.65	89
4. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.	1.88	0.75	86	2.12	0.93	89
5. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.	2.29	0.59	86	2.33	0.52	89
6. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.	3.93	0.56	86	3.83	0.56	89

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

philosophy of the school or to judge how well it is achieving its curricular objectives (Items 1 and 5).

These two sets of findings in combination strongly imply that principals welcome the participation of parents in activities which they and their staffs can carefully delimit and control and which do not invade the professional prerogatives of teachers. They resist parental involvement in anything integrally related to the core professional activity--teaching--and its definition, performance, or evaluation. When parents, for example, attend school assemblies or assist teachers on class trips, their presence is hardly a serious threat to teaching or learning. But allowing parents to participate in discussions of educational philosophy, curriculum, or the achievement of the school's objectives would concede to them a direct influence on the school program and its staff.

The principals' apparent disapproval of using parents as part-time helpers to teachers is of special interest. This, if allowed, would bring them directly into the teachers' place of business and make them witnesses and possibly critics of the teachers' performance. Another reason why most principals may not welcome their involvement here is that in the elementary school the child is supposed to be judged by norms of universalistic achievement not the particularistic ones of his family.¹⁵ The child and his family as well frequently must readjust to this new basis of evaluation. Moreover, to see their child regarded as but one member of a class may be a traumatic experience to many a parent. The parents would observe at the same time the classroom behavior of other children in the local neighborhood. The child often is a

source of intimate revelations about his family, and he can be embarrassingly candid at times. Professionals have a right to access to such information, bound as they are to respect confidences about client affairs; but not so the parents of other children. The familiar nature of the subject-matter in the primary grades, as we noted earlier, also may make it relatively easy for a parent to raise questions about the techniques and content of teaching. But the teacher lacks a rigorous justification of why she does what she does, hence a parent in the classroom may create tensions. And finally, if it is true that elementary school teaching is a vocation involving little esoteric knowledge, then what little mystique there is about it may be further reduced if outsiders become observers.¹⁶

Did the women and men differ in any important respects in regard to the activities which they encouraged the parents to share? The answer, in general, is no (Table 11-3). Of the six kinds of parental participation we considered, the only sex difference worthy of any note occurs in the principals' use of parents as an advisory group in making out the course of study: the men involve parents in it slightly more often than do the women.

Notes and References for Chapter Eleven

1. Neal Gross, Who Runs Our Schools? (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1958).

2. A lay person is seldom able to evaluate the competence of a professional in any technical way, but in the medical instance, he can assess whether or not he feels "better" or in the case of the law, whether he is winning or losing his case. The point we wish to emphasize is that a child is less able than an adult to make even an approximate assessment of the services he receives.

3. Howard S. Becker, et al., Boys in White (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961), p. 410.

4. Everett C. Hughes, Man and Their Work (Glencoe: The Free Press, 1958), p. 79.

5. It should be noted, however, that as teachers receive training in the new and revised curricula in mathematics, science, social studies, etc. that have been developed in recent years for the elementary schools they will be in a better position to claim expertise in knowledge that is less familiar and more complex to laymen, and thus parents may feel less qualified to assess their teaching performance.

6. Burton R. Clark, Educating the Expert Society (San Francisco: Chandler Publishing Co., 1962), p. 159.

7. Selznick defines cooptation as "the process of absorbing new elements into the leadership or policy-determining structure of an organization as a means of averting threats to its stability or existence."

See his TVA and the Grassroots (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1949), pp. 259-264.

8. For evidence in support of this assumption, see Chapter Three, Table 3-22.

9. For evidence supporting this assumption, see Chapter Six, Table 6-4.

10. For evidence supporting this assumption, see Chapter Five, Table 5-7.

11. The other factor may be designated as Cooperation with Parents. The teacher-observers reported on only two of the items in this factor. See Chapter One for a discussion of the source of the factor weights used in computing measures of the principals' performance.

12. See Appendix C, Table C-21, for the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in computing the index of Involvement of Parents in School Affairs.

13. Since the finding was opposite to the prediction, a two-tailed test of statistical significance was employed.

14. This statement is based on the use of a two-tailed test of statistical significance. All tests of significance applied to the data in Table 11-2 are two-tailed.

Chapter 12: Organizational Performance

An aphorism common among school administrators is: "As the principal, so the school." Does it follow that schools whose principals are men differ characteristically from those whose principals are women? More specifically, do they vary as to the teachers' professional performance and morale and the pupils' learning--matters which have been made the criteria for evaluating schools?

These are intriguing questions not only to the sociologist interested in the relationship between sex roles and the functioning of organizations but also to all who must deal with a problem of great practical importance: should the individual's sex be taken into account in the selection of an elementary school principal? As noted earlier, the proportion of women in the principalship has been steadily declining in the past three decades; yet, although the national professional association of elementary school principals has shown an interest in the trend,¹ only slight consideration has been given to its implications. If schools managed by men do not differ in "productivity" or teachers' morale from those managed by women, or if schools managed by men fare better in these respects than those administered by women, then the present trend, while it frustrates women teachers who aspire to become administrators, it is of little consequence from the viewpoint of the schools. But if schools with women principals tend to outdo those with men then the practice of reserving vacancies in the elementary principalship for men must be reassessed. In short, whether the sex of principals is related to performance and productivity is a question entailing important implications for policy in public education.

The Performance of Teachers

In his formal and his informal relationships with them a principal has many opportunities to influence his teachers' performance. He may encourage his staff to try out new instructional methods and materials; he may help those who have difficulty in maintaining discipline, or in organizing classroom activities; he may, in effect, determine their attitudes toward innovations by the higher administration. A principal, then, can largely determine whether his staff adopts a professional attitude and expresses it in their work.

Why should we expect any relationship between the sex of principals and the professional performance of their teachers? We reasoned that teachers would achieve a more professional performance in schools administered by women than by men, the hypothesis being based on three assumptions: women, in comparison with men, bring longer teaching experience to their work, have greater self-confidence in their ability to direct instruction, and are more deeply committed to the principalship. We further assumed that where principals have more practical experience in the core activities of the profession, greater self-confidence in their ability to be of service to their staffs, and are more deeply committed to their own professional responsibilities, the teachers will find the situation more conducive to maintaining or striving for high standards of teaching than it would be were the administrators less imbued with these professional attributes. From this line of reasoning, it follows that in schools with women principals more of the teachers would meet higher standards of practice than would be the case under men principals.

6

To test this hypothesis, we require an index of the variation among the schools in our sample in the professional performance of their teachers. Such a measure was developed from the responses of the from four to 10 teacher-observers in each school to the following questions: "Of the teachers in your school what per cent:"

1. Are committed to doing the best job of which they are capable.
2. Maintain a professional attitude towards their work.
3. Maintain an interest in improving the educational program of the school.
4. Maintain effective discipline in their classes.
5. Usually "drag their feet" when new ideas are introduced into the school program.
6. Try new teaching methods in their classrooms.
7. Do "textbook" teaching only.
8. Waste a lot of time in their classroom activities.

Examining the correlation matrix of the responses to these questions revealed them to be highly interrelated. A single dimension may be extracted from them as a summary measure of Teachers' Professional Performance. Therefore, their responses were subjected to a principal components factor analysis. By use of the resulting factor weights a factor score was computed for each observer's responses.² The scores for all teacher-observers in each school were then averaged to obtain the best estimate of the teachers' professional performance in their school, and it is these summary "factor scores" that we shall use in testing the hypothesis.

When the mean scores of the schools administered by the women and the men are compared on our index of the Professional Performance of Teachers, the findings support the hypothesis: schools with women principals have a higher mean score than those administered by men (13.29 vs. 12.24), and the difference of 1.05 is statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 12-1).

To determine whether the relationship between sex of principal and professional performance of teachers might be a function of confounding variables, we undertook two additional analyses. The first explored the possibility that the relationship might be due to the age difference between the two groups (the women were, on the average, five years older than the men³) and the second that it could be attributed to the possible circumstance that the women principals' staffs had greater teaching experience than the men's. That neither of these third variables accounts for the primary relationship is demonstrated in Table 12-2. When we classified the principals into three age groups and then computed the mean scores on the Index of Professional Performance of Teachers of their staffs, the sex difference obtained for the entire sample is found to occur in each age category. The same pattern of sex differences also occurs when we classify the principals into subcategories by mean teaching experience of their staffs.

The relationship between sex of principal and the professional performance of their teachers persists in nearly all the other analyses we conducted to determine further if the findings obtained in the entire sample are internally replicated under the following subclassifications

Table 12-1. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Professional Performance of Their Teachers

(N = 166)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	13.29	3.22	84
Men	12.24	3.66	32

* Data unavailable for 23 of the 189 principals.

$t = 1.95$; $p < .05$.

Table 12-2. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Professional Performance of Their Teachers by Two Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	13.35	1.77	11	12.61	3.33	30	+
Middle	13.24	2.72	32	11.16	3.86	26	+
Old	13.31	3.82	41	12.89	3.57	26	+
<u>Mean Experience of Teachers</u>							
Short	12.24	3.65	29	11.60	4.25	27	+
Medium	13.12	2.98	27	12.76	2.94	28	+
Long	14.39	2.38	27	12.33	3.58	27	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

of the data: region, city size, size of school, socio-economic composition of the student body, and sex ratio of the staff. Of 16 additional sub-group comparisons, 14 of the Teachers' Professional Performance scores were higher in schools with women principals. The two exceptions were the smallest schools and those whose pupils had "medium" socio-economic ratings (Table 12-3).

To learn whether the empirical evidence supports the reasoning, we again, as in previous analyses of this type, first asked whether each posited intervening variable is in fact related to both the independent variable (sex) and the dependent variable (professional performance of teachers) in the manner assumed. Of any that are, we then asked whether the magnitude of the zero-order relationship between the independent and dependent variables decreases when the third variable is held constant through partial correlational analysis.

It will be recalled that the hypothesis was based on the assumptions that: (a) women principals have had more elementary teaching experience than the men; (b) the women have greater self-confidence in their ability to direct instruction than the men; (c) the women are more deeply committed to the principalship than the men; and (d) these sex differences have their effect upon the performance of their staffs.

The data show (Table 12-4) that:

- (1) the women have more years of elementary teaching experience than the men and that teaching experience is positively related to the professional performance of teachers.
- (2) women principals assess their own ability to direct instruction

Table 12-3. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Professional Performance of Their Teachers by Five Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	12.55	4.50	10	12.08	2.80	17	+
Midwest	13.00	2.49	26	12.17	2.91	27	+
East	12.64	3.23	30	9.56	4.77	10	+
South	15.21	2.44	18	13.36	3.78	28	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	13.68	2.68	45	12.67	3.12	46	+
Medium	13.11	3.80	29	12.13	3.77	27	+
Large	12.01	3.24	10	10.38	5.00	9	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	13.41	3.65	30	13.93	3.01	26	-
Medium	13.72	2.86	35	12.45	3.87	25	+
Large	12.30	2.90	19	10.65	3.28	31	+
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	12.81	3.82	26	10.64	4.24	30	+
Middle	12.99	3.10	25	13.02	2.87	29	-
High	13.89	2.65	33	13.34	2.91	23	+
<u>Proportion of Men Teachers</u>							
Low	14.80	1.83	26	13.83	3.05	22	+
Medium	13.21	3.15	30	11.67	3.46	29	+
High	11.96	3.67	28	11.64	3.89	31	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 12-4. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the
Assumed Intervening Variables and the Independent
Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable
(Professional Performance of Teachers)

(N = 164)

Assumed Intervening Variable	Sex [#] (Point-biserial <u>r</u>)	Professional Performance of Teachers (Pearsonian <u>r</u>)
Years of elementary school teaching experience	.60*	.15*
Self-evaluation of ability to direct instructional program	.30*	-.01
Commitment to the principalship	.20*	.10

Female = 1; male = 0.

* $p < .05$.

more highly than do the men, but there is no relationship between this and the professional performance of their teachers.

- (3) the women are more deeply committed to the principalship than the men but commitment is not related at below the .05 level to the professional performance of teachers.⁴

In short, only one of the posited variables, elementary teaching experience, meets the specifications necessary if it is to be considered further as an intervening variable.

Next, we examine whether this one variable meets the final condition: that when it is held constant the zero-order relationship between sex and teachers' performance drops. Thus, the zero-order point-biserial correlation between sex and the teachers' professional performance is 0.15; the relationship drops to 0.07 when we hold constant the variable, experience in elementary teaching. Although the size of the zero-order correlation between sex and teachers' professional performance is relatively low (0.15), it does diminish when the third variable is taken into account. We interpret these findings as supporting the possibility that the principal's own experience in elementary school teaching does act as an intervening variable, but that the other two posited intervening variables, self-assessment of ability to direct instruction and commitment to the principalship, clearly do not (Table 12-5).

Pupils' Performance

When we compare schools administered by men and women administrators, do we also find that the women's schools surpass the men's as to

Table 12-5. Zero-order and First-order Partial Correlation Coefficients
of Sex and Professional Performance of Teachers

(N = 164)

	Zero- order <u>r</u>	First- order Partial <u>r</u>
Sex and Professional Performance of Teachers	.15	
<u>Holding constant:</u>		
Years of elementary school teaching experience		.07

the learning of the pupils? Our hypothesis was that schools under the leadership of women and of men do differ in this fashion. We assumed that it is the teachers who most directly influence pupils' learning and that the principals' influence is not through direct associations with pupils, but indirectly through their teachers. If we further assume that the performance of teachers is better under women superiors than under men (and we have evidence for this assumption), then it follows that in schools administered by women, the pupils' learning will on the average exceed that in schools administered by men.

To obtain indices we had asked the teacher-observers in each school questions about the pupils in their classes. The five questions relevant to learning were: "Of the pupils you teach, what per cent:"

1. Are one or more years behind grade level in reading ability.
2. Are not mastering the subject matter or skills you teach at the minimum level of satisfactory performance.
3. Are not interested in academic achievement.
4. Were not adequately prepared to do the grade level work you expected of them when they entered your class.
5. Work up to their intellectual capacities.

Two limitations in the reports are immediately apparent: the first is that first-year pupils were not in the principals' schools long enough to have been influenced by them. The second is that the reports of beginning teachers might be open to question because of their limited experience. We therefore eliminated the reports of observers who taught the first grade or who were in their first year of teaching.

This reduced our sample of observers from 1,235 teachers in 166 schools to 964 teachers in 152 schools.⁵

To secure a summary measure of the indices of pupils' performance, a principal components factor analysis was performed. The resulting factor weights⁶ were then attached to the average reports of the teacher-observers to obtain "school scores."

When the teacher-observer reports were summarized in this manner, we found that the data support the hypothesis that schools administered by women are, on the average, characterized by learning on the part of the pupils which is superior to that in schools under the jurisdiction of men. The mean academic score of pupils in schools administered by women is 12.20 and of those with men principals 10.89 (high score represents greater learning by pupils) and the difference of 1.31 between them is statistically significant at below the .01 level (Table 12-6).

This finding, however, could be due to the influence of another variable, the social-economic status of the pupils in the principals' schools, since other research has established a relationship between this and the learning of pupils.⁷ In our own study, the relationship between indices of socio-economic status of the pupils as a body and measures of their learning is substantial.⁸ If it happened that women are more frequently appointed as principals of schools of high socio-economic status than men, the relationship between sex and pupils' performance could be explained by that fact alone. To explore this possibility, we subclassified the principals into three groups on the basis of the average socio-economic status of their pupils and computed the

Table 12-6. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Pupils' Performance
(N = 152)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	12.20	2.86	79
Men	10.89	3.23	73

* Data unavailable for 37 of the 189 principals.

$t = -2.64$; $p < .01$.

scores for their learning in schools administered by men and by women (Table 12-7). The analysis reveals that regardless of socio-economic level, the pupils learned better in schools with women principals than in those with men administrators. The original finding is sustained.

To determine the internal consistency of this finding in the entire sample, we re-examined the relationship between the principals' sex and the learning of pupils under the following subgroupings: region, size of city, size of school, mean age of the teaching staff, their average teaching experience, their competence as assessed by the principals, the age of principals, and their marital status. In 21 of the 23 comparisons we were able to make, the learning scores of the pupils were higher in the women's schools than in those of the men (Table 12-8). This strong pattern of consistent findings re-enforces our confidence in concluding that schools administered by men and women principals do differ as to learning on the part of the pupils.

Is there any empirical support for the reasoning underlying the hypothesis? We had assumed that the association between sex and pupils' learning depended upon the fact that the teachers perform in a more professional manner when under women superiors.

Do the empirical findings support this line of reasoning? First, let us see whether the variable, teachers' professional performance, posited as intervening between the independent variable (sex) and the dependent variable (pupils' learning) is in fact related to both. Table 12-9 reveals that in school administered by women teachers adhere to higher standards of professional performance than in those

Table 12-7. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Pupils' Performance by Socio-economic Level of Student Body

Subclassification*	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Socio-economic Level</u>							
Low	10.19	2.88	25	8.59	3.25	28	+
Middle	11.94	2.40	23	11.27	2.00	25	+
High	14.01	1.93	31	13.64	1.92	20	+

* See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 12-8. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Pupils' Performance by Eight Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Region</u>							
West	11.86	3.27	9	11.57	3.50	15	+
Midwest	12.27	2.76	26	11.08	2.50	24	+
East	12.51	2.68	29	9.26	3.74	9	+
South	11.70	3.36	15	10.89	3.51	25	+
<u>Size of City</u>							
Small	12.80	2.55	45	11.36	3.16	38	+
Medium	12.02	3.02	24	11.21	2.89	27	+
Large	9.91	2.94	10	7.62	3.20	8	+
<u>Size of School</u>							
Small	12.99	2.49	28	11.02	3.39	21	+
Medium	12.46	2.92	33	11.72	2.84	22	+
Large	10.50	2.78	18	10.20	3.35	30	+
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>							
Young	12.17	2.96	30	10.32	3.30	23	+
Middle	12.00	2.58	28	11.11	3.51	22	+
Old	12.50	3.21	21	11.20	3.01	28	+

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 12-8. (Cont.)

Subclassification [#]	Women			Men			Direction Predicted Correctly (+) or Incorrectly (-)
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	
<u>Mean Teacher Experience</u>							
Short	11.24	2.92	26	10.07	3.44	25	+
Medium	12.90	2.11	27	11.32	3.56	24	+
Long	12.48	3.38	25	11.32	2.58	24	+
<u>Competence of Staff</u>							
Low	10.62	3.01	20	9.01	3.54	20	+
Medium	11.92	2.59	28	11.61	3.01	27	+
High	13.79	2.18	29	11.59	2.70	26	+
<u>Age of Principal</u>							
Young	12.55	2.14	10	9.98	3.88	26	+
Middle	11.79	3.46	30	11.88	2.46	23	-
Old	12.43	2.55	39	10.94	2.94	24	+
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>							
Married	10.59	2.91	20	11.14	3.08	66	-
Single	--	--	52	--	--	4	*
Other	--	--	7	--	--	3	*

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No comparison made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

Table 12-9. Correlation Coefficients for the Relationship Between the Assumed Intervening Variable and the Independent Variable (Sex) and Dependent Variable (Pupils' Performance)

(N = 152)

Assumed Intervening Variable	Sex [#] (Point-biserial <u>r</u>)	Pupils' Performance (Pearsonian <u>r</u>)
Professional performance of teachers	.21*	.39*

Female = 1; male = 0.

* $p < .05$.

managed by men and that teachers' performance is positively related to pupils' learning. the second condition that must be met before the professional performance of teachers can be considered as an intervening variable is that where it is held constant the zero-order relationship between sex and learning by pupils declines. The zero-order correlation between sex and pupils' learning was .21, and when a partial correlational analysis was made of the two variables, holding constant the third, professional performance of teachers, the relationship dropped to .16. The findings provide some slight support for the line of reasoning underlying the hypothesis (Table 12-10).

Teachers' Morale

When we asked principals what weight they would attribute to each of 25 criteria for evaluating schools similar to their own,⁹ they assigned the greatest weight to "the morale of the teachers in the school." Is there any relationship between sex of the principal and this standard for judging the schools? This is the question we now examine.

The hypothesis we developed is based on two assumptions, which led to opposite conclusions. The first was that subordinates prefer men to women as their superiors at work. For the women teachers, we anticipated a condition similar to that existing in American industry as reported by Gardner, who declares "for the most part women themselves prefer to be supervised by men, and few express a preference for a woman as their boss."¹⁰ Presupposing a basic similarity in industry and education, we assumed that the small proportion of elementary school teachers who are

Table 12-10. Zero-order and First-order Partial Correlation Coefficients
of Sex and Pupils' Performance
(N = 152)

	Zero- order <u>r</u>	First- order Partial <u>r</u>
Sex and Pupils' Performance	.21	
<u>Holding constant:</u>		
Professional performance of teachers		.16

men might resent being subordinate to a woman principal. If we further assume that when the preferences of subordinates as to the sex of their superiors are not followed, it has an unfavorable effect on their morale, then we would expect that of both men and women teachers the morale would be higher under male principals.

The opposing line of reasoning was: if it is assumed that the staffs' morale is a function in part of the ability of superiors to offer useful advice to subordinates and if it is further assumed that women principals can help their teachers more than men because of their greater experience and knowledge, then we would expect staff morale to be higher in schools administered by women. Since these two lines of reasoning lead to opposite conclusions, we tested the null hypothesis that the sex of principals is not related to the morale of their teachers.

The measure of teachers' morale used to test the hypothesis was developed from the responses of the teacher-observers in each school to the following six questions: "Of the teachers in your school, what percent:"

1. Display a sense of pride in the school.
2. Enjoy working in the school.
3. Display a sense of loyalty to the school.
4. Respect the judgment of the administrators of the school.
5. Accept the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school.
6. Work cooperatively with their fellow teachers.

We found a high degree of intercorrelation among the responses, suggesting that a summary index to measure Teachers' Morale could be developed. A principal components factor analysis was then performed on the correlation matrix, and the resulting factor weights¹¹ were attached to the averaged reports of the teacher-observers to secure a score on teachers' morale for each school.

When we compared these mean scores in schools administered by men with scores in those supervised by women, we found the null hypothesis was supported: the mean score of the women's schools was 11.77 and of the men's, 11.72 (high score reflects high morale) and the difference of 0.05 is not statistically significant at below the .05 level (Table 12-11).

Our confidence in this conclusion is strengthened by additional analyses that we undertook of the mean score on teachers' morale for schools administered by men and women under the following subclassifications of the data: region, size of city, size of school, mean age of the teaching staff, their average teaching experience, their competence as assessed by the principals, the age of principals, and their marital status. Of the 23 comparisons we were able to make, we found that for all of them there was not a statistically significant sex difference at below the .05 level (Table 12-12).¹²

12-24

Table 12-11. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Teachers' Morale
(N = 171)*

Sex	Mean Score	Standard Deviation	Number of Cases
Women	11.77	4.22	85
Men	11.72	3.73	86

* Data unavailable for 18 of the 189 principals.

$t = 0.09$; $p > .05$.

Table 12-12. Mean Scores of Women and Men Principals on Teachers' Morale by Eight Specified Subclassifications

Subclassification [#]	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Prob- ability Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Region</u>						
West	11.02	10	12.05	18	-0.52	n.s.
Midwest	11.93	26	11.76	28	0.20	n.s.
East	10.92	31	8.56	11	1.42	n.s.
South	13.42	18	12.67	29	0.88	n.s.
<u>Size of City</u>						
Small	12.07	45	11.92	48	0.21	n.s.
Medium	11.61	29	11.85	28	-0.20	n.s.
Large	10.95	11	10.38	10	0.27	n.s.
<u>Size of School</u>						
Small	11.57	30	13.12	29	-1.27	n.s.
Medium	12.65	36	11.62	26	1.15	n.s.
Large	10.42	19	10.49	31	-0.08	n.s.
<u>Mean Age of Teachers</u>						
Young	11.26	31	10.55	27	0.74	n.s.
Middle	12.05	30	12.27	27	-0.19	n.s.
Old	12.08	24	12.24	32	-0.15	n.s.

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

Table 12-12. (Cont.)

Subclassification [#]	Women		Men		<u>t</u>	Prob- ability Less than
	Mean	N	Mean	N		
<u>Mean Experience of Teachers</u>						
Short	10.38	29	11.07	28	-0.58	n.s.
Medium	12.05	27	12.25	30	-0.21	n.s.
Long	12.81	28	11.79	28	1.05	n.s.
<u>Competence of Staff</u>						
Low	9.62	23	9.73	22	-0.07	n.s.
Medium	11.41	30	12.09	33	-0.81	n.s.
High	14.02	30	12.74	31	1.78	n.s.
<u>Age of Principal</u>						
Young	12.20	11	11.67	32	0.46	n.s.
Middle	11.80	33	12.21	27	-0.41	n.s.
Old	11.63	41	11.28	27	0.31	n.s.
<u>Marital Status of Principal</u>						
Married	10.94	23	11.84	78	-1.07	n.s.
Single	12.06	55	12.55	5	-0.24	n.s.
Other	--	7	--	3	*	n.s.

[#] See Appendix A for the definition of the subclassification categories.

* No comparison made when number of cases in smaller category is less than five.

Notes and References for Chapter Twelve

1. "The Elementary School Principalship--A Research Study," Thirty-seventh Yearbook, The National Elementary Principal, Department of Elementary School Principals, National Education Association (1958), pp. 110-111.
2. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in obtaining a summary measure of teachers' professional performance see Appendix C, Table C-22.
3. See Chapter Two for a more extensive discussion of the age differences between the men and women principals.
4. The measure of commitment to the principalship was based on the principals' responses to 18 items dealing with six occupational positions which a principal might be offered. For example, with respect to a job offer to accept an administrative position with a reputable textbook company, he was asked if he would or would not accept the job (a) "with the same salary as my present one;" (b) "with a salary \$2,000 greater than my present one;" (c) "with a salary \$4,000 greater than my present one." A Commitment Scale was then developed on the basis of a two-step scaling process. The three categories in each of the six areas were scaled with coefficients of reproducibility all in excess of .997. The resulting scale scores were then developed into a six-item Guttman scale.
5. For a further consideration of this matter, see Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriott, The Professional Leadership of Elementary School Principals, Final Report No. 1, Cooperative Research Project No. 853,

April 1964, pp. 3-12 -- 3-13.

6. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used in obtaining a summary measure of school scores of pupils' performance, see Appendix C, Table C-23.

7. See Patricia Sexton, Education and Income (New York: The Viking Press, 1961), for a study of the relationship between the socio-economic background of pupils and its influence on their learning activities; and Joseph A. Kahl, The American Class Structure (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961), for a summary of sociological studies bearing on this question.

8. For example, the coefficient of linear correlation between the percentage of pupils' parents whose average income was more than \$5,000 and the percentage of pupils one or more years behind grade level in reading ability (as reported by their teachers) was $-.61$ for a sample of 152 of the elementary schools. See Gross and Herriott, op. cit., p. 3-18.

9. For a description of the procedure used to obtain the principals' assessment of different criteria for evaluating schools, see Chapter Five.

10. Burleigh B. Gardner, Human Relations in Industry (Chicago: Richard D. Irwin, Inc., 1945), p. 270.

11. For the item means, standard deviations, and weights used to secure a score on teachers' morale for each school, see Appendix C, Table C-24.

12. A two-tailed test of significance was used for these comparisons since a null hypothesis was being tested.

Chapter 13: Summary and Conclusions

This inquiry, one part of the National Principalship Study, was conducted with four types of questions in mind. First, are there differences in the careers of men and women who serve as principals of public elementary schools? Second, are there sex differences in their orientations and reactions to this position? Third, does the role performance of men and women principals vary? And fourth, do schools administered by men and women principals differ in any important organizational respects? The data required to examine these questions were obtained from a national cross-section of 189 elementary school principals in 41 large school systems in the United States as well as from their teachers. In this chapter we summarize our major findings. It is important, however, for those who might wish to make use of them to keep certain cautions in mind.

First, the data used in this study were obtained in 1960-1961 from a sample of elementary school principals in cities with populations of 50,000 or over. The findings, therefore, apply only to elementary school principals in cities of this size. It would be inappropriate to draw conclusions on the basis of our findings about circumstances associated with the sex of principals in secondary schools or for elementary administrators who work in small suburban communities or in rural areas. Other studies must be undertaken before it can be claimed that our findings do or do not apply to these populations.

Second it would be inappropriate to apply the findings obtained in this study about circumstances and conditions associated with the sex of principals of elementary schools to men and women executives of

other kinds of organizations. Whether our findings about sex differences among principals in their level of aspiration or worry, for example, are applicable to men and women executives employed in government or business remain open questions that can only be answered by additional research.

Third, it cannot be emphasized too strongly that our findings have reference to group or class, not individual, differences between men and women principals. To conclude that women invariably exercise greater control over their staffs than men from our finding that women on the average tend to exert greater control over the performance of their teachers than men principals would constitute an erroneous deduction. With these cautions in mind we now turn to a summary of our most important findings.

The first objective of our study was to determine whether the sex of principals had a bearing on their career decisions and occupational histories. We found that women considered and made up their minds to become teachers at a much earlier age than men and that men gave serious consideration to becoming a principal at a much earlier stage in their careers than women. Our findings revealed that most men, but only a minority of the women, claimed that they had no strong initial motivation to become teachers and that teaching was the first-choice vocation for the great majority of the women but for only half of the men. We also found that men and women were exposed to different amounts and types of encouragement and discouragement in their career decisions.

Moreover, our data also revealed that whether a principal is a man or woman influenced the length of time it took to become a principal: over four times the proportion of men than women became principals within 10 years after they became teachers and over twice the percentage of men than women were 35 years or younger when they first became principals. Furthermore, although there were only minor sex differences in career histories with reference to system-wide and in-school administrative jobs prior to the first principalship, the men and women did differ greatly in the type of teaching experience they brought to the elementary principalship: 34 per cent of the men in comparison with three per cent of the women had never taught in the elementary school at all and the mean years of elementary teaching experience of women was over three times as great as the men's (14.7 vs. 4.6 years). We conclude from these findings that the sex of elementary school principals did have a bearing on the timing, context, and motivation of their career decisions and also influenced the amount and kinds of educational experience they brought to their administrative position.

The second problem area we examined was the influence of the principals' sex on their reactions to and feelings about their work. Our findings revealed that women principals had a lower aspiration for occupational advancement than men and that women also tended to worry less about their work. In regard to sex-linked differences in educational values, we found that women principals gave more stress than men to the importance of a school's taking into account individual differences among pupils, its concern for delinquency-prone pupils, and its interest

in the social and emotional development of the child. No general sex differences were uncovered in the emphasis placed on the academic performance of pupils or on the school's ability to maintain pupil discipline. In regard to criteria for evaluating teachers, the data revealed that women placed more emphasis than men on their technical skills and their responsibility to the total school. Our investigation of the way men and women principals viewed their basic functions and assessed their performance in them and the satisfaction they experienced from them showed that women on the average evaluated their performance more highly on, and derived more satisfaction from, supervising instruction but that there was no sex difference for the entire sample in the importance they attributed to it. In regard to the management of routine administrative affairs, we found that the men and women did not differ in the importance they assigned to it or their evaluation of their ability to perform it, but that men did derive greater satisfaction from this component of their work than women. On the basis of these findings, we conclude that sex also influences the way principals view and react to their work in many important respects.

The third and fourth major problem areas of the study focused on an examination of the relationship of the sex of principals to their performance and the operation of their schools. We found sex differences for the entire sample on two dimensions of the principals' behavior: women exerted greater control over their teachers' professional activities than men and they associated more frequently with them outside of school than did their male counterparts. Although some

conditional relationships were uncovered on dimensions of their performance, no sex differences existed for the entire sample on the principals' support of teachers in teacher-pupil conflict, their stress on obtaining maximum service from their staffs for the benefit of pupils, their social distance from their teachers in the school, and their involvement of parents in school affairs. Finally, our analysis of the association between the sex of principals and the characteristics of their schools revealed that the professional performance of teachers and pupils' learning were higher on the average in schools administered by women than by men. We found that staff morale, however, was not associated with the sex of the principal. These findings lead us to conclude that the performance of principals and the operation of their schools are associated in certain respects, but not in others, with the sex of their principals.

**Appendix A: Definition of Subclassifications of Variables Used in
"Third Variable Analyses"**

A number of tables in the report compare women and men principals on some specified variable (for example, level of aspiration or worry) under subclassifications of various characteristics of the principals or their schools (see, for example, Chapter Four, Table 4-2 and Chapter Seven, Tables 7-2 and 7-3). Tables of this type are used to introduce third variables into the analysis for one of the three following purposes: (1) to determine if findings for the total sample are "internally replicated" in subclassifications of the sample; (2) to examine conditional relationships; and (3) to ascertain if a relationship found between the sex of principals and a particular variable could be "explained away" by a confounding third variable. This appendix specifies the definition of the subclassifications of variables used in these tables and the number of elementary principals in each subclassification.

Subclassification	Number of Principals in the Subcategory
-------------------	---

Characteristics of PrincipalsAge

Young - Under 46 years of age	48
Medium - 46 - 55 years of age	69
Old - 56 years of age or older	72

Marital Status

Married	115
Single	62
Other (widowed or divorced)	12

Characteristics of SchoolsSize of School

Small - Under 541 pupils	63
Medium - 541 to 750 pupils	64
Large - Over 750 pupils	62

Size of City

Small - Population of 50,000 to 249,999	89
Medium - Population of 250,000 to 999,999	68
Large - Population of 1,000,000 and over	32

Mean Age of Teachers

Young - 24.2 to 38.9 years	65
Middle - 39.0 to 43.4 years	60
Old - 43.5 to 52.5 years	63

Subclassification	Number of Principals in the Subcategory
<u>Characteristics of Schools (Cont.)</u>	
<u>Mean Experience of Teachers</u>	
Short - 2.8 to 11.2 years	63
Medium - 11.3 to 15.1 years	61
Long - 15.2 to 23.2 years	63
<u>Variance in Teachers' Ages (σ^2)</u>	
Low - 1.6 to 17.7 years	62
Medium - 17.8 to 24.6 years	63
High - 24.7 to 51.0 years	62
<u>Proportion of Men Teachers (of the total teaching faculty)</u>	
Low - Under 7 per cent	58
Medium - 8 to 15 per cent	68
High - 16 to 42 per cent	63
<u>Percentage of Staff Viewed as Competent by Principal</u>	
Low - 70 per cent or under	51
Medium - 71 to 89 per cent	69
High - 90 to 100 per cent	67
<u>Region (Based on 1960 U. S. Census classification)</u>	
West - Mountain, Pacific States	33
Midwest - East North Central, West North Central States	56

Subclassification	Number of Principals in the Subcategory
<u>Characteristics of Schools (Cont.)</u>	
<u>Region (Cont.)</u>	
East - New England, Middle Atlantic States	52
South - South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central States	48
<u>Average Socio-economic Level of Parents of Pupils in a School*</u>	
Low - S.E.S. factor scores 7.91 to 8.80	64
Middle - S.E.S. factor scores 8.81 to 10.25	62
High - S.E.S. factor scores 10.26 to 14.41	63

* Determined by an S.E.S. factor score for each school derived from factor loadings applied to the principals' responses to the following six questions: "What percentage of the students in your school:"

1. Come from homes where at least one parent is a college graduate.
2. Come from homes where neither parent has gone to school beyond high school.
3. Come from homes where the father is a professional person, business executive, or manager.
4. Come from homes where the father is an unskilled or semi-skilled worker.
5. Come from homes where the parents have a combined family income of \$10,000 or more?
6. Come from homes where the parents have a combined family income of less than \$5,000.

Appendix B: Specimen Research Instruments

The multiple objectives of the National Principalship Study required the collection of a large body of data from the three types of school personnel who participated in it: principals, teachers, and higher administrators. The research instruments used in the Study numbered 192 pages. Several of the instruments used to obtain data required for the present study were presented in Appendix A of Final Report No. 1 of Cooperative Research Project No. 853: questionnaires concerned with the job history and personal and social background of the principals, the self-evaluation instrument, a part of the interview schedule concerned with the importance principals attach to various aspects of their work. We present below four additional instruments used to obtain measures of central variables examined in the study of men and women as elementary principals: their worry (B-1), the weight they assign different criteria for evaluating teachers (B-2), the satisfaction they derive from various aspects of their work (B-3), and their role performance (B-4).

B-2

**B-1: Instrument Used to Measure the Worry Principals Express in
Their Work**

<u>Instructions</u> Listed below are a number of things that sometimes trouble principals. Please answer Question 18 by <u>circling</u> the <u>one</u> letter that best represents your reply.	<u>Question 18</u> To what extent does each of the following occur in your situation? A = I very frequently B = I frequently C = I sometimes D = I almost never E = I never
1. Worry about possible physical injuries to individual students while they are at school.	A B C D E
2. Worry about the possible occurrence of a "disaster" (e.g., serious fire, food poisoning, etc.) at my school.	A B C D E
3. Am concerned that what I do or say may cause me to be disliked by my teachers.	A B C D E
4. Worry about what an individual or group may do if I make a decision contrary to their wishes.	A B C D E
5. Worry about what is going on in my school when I am away from it for any length of time during school hours.	A B C D E
6. Am kept awake at night thinking about problems associated with my job.	A B C D E
7. Am concerned about the impression I will make when I have to speak to a group of parents.	A B C D E
8. Am concerned about the impression I will make when I have to speak to a group of teachers.	A B C D E
9. Find myself worrying whether I have made the right decision on a matter with which I have just dealt.	A B C D E
10. Have anxiety when I deal with "complaining" parents.	A B C D E
11. Feel nervous when I attend PTA or other parent meetings.	A B C D E
-----	-----

B-4

B-2: Instrument Used to Measure the Weight Principals Apply to
Different Criteria for Evaluating Teachers

<u>Instructions</u> Listed below are some factors which are frequently used in the evaluation of teachers. Please answer Question 2 and Question 3 by <u>circling</u> the letter and number which best represent your judgment.	<u>Question 2</u> In your judgment, what weight <u>should be given</u> to each of the following factors in evaluating how well a teacher is carrying out his or her job? A = very great weight B = considerable weight C = some weight D = little weight E = no weight at all	<u>Question 3</u> In evaluating the teachers in your school, what weight <u>do you give</u> ? 1 = very great weight 2 = considerable weight 3 = some weight 4 = little weight 5 = no weight at all
<u>Factors</u>		
1. Attendance at PTA or parent meetings.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
2. Participation in civic affairs.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
3. Cooperation with school administration.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
4. Interest in social and emotional development of students.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
5. Willingness to serve on committees of the school.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
6. Ability to maintain good relations with fellow teachers.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
7. Participation in extra-curricular school activities.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
8. Dress and general appearance.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
9. Ability to maintain classroom discipline.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
10. Comprehensiveness of lesson plans.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
11. Knowledge of subject matter.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
12. Ability to make subject matter interesting to students.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5

Please continue answering Questions 2 and 3..	<u>Question 2</u> In your judgment, what weight <u>should be given</u> to each of the following factors in evaluating how well a teacher is carrying out his or her job? A = very great weight B = considerable weight C = some weight D = little weight E = no weight at all	<u>Question 3</u> In evaluating the teachers in your school, what weight <u>do you give</u>? 1 = very great weight 2 = considerable weight 3 = some weight 4 = little weight 5 = no weight at all
13. Attendance at state educational conventions.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
14. Popularity with the student body.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
15. Willingness to stay after school to help students with their difficulties.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
16. Ability to maintain good relations with parents.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
17. Academic progress of students.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
18. Cooperation with staff specialists.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
19. Willingness to participate in in-service training programs.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
20. Contributions to faculty meetings.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
21. Extent to which they write articles for professional journals.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
22. Willingness to give up free-time for good of the school.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
23. Attractiveness of classroom displays.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
24. Social habits in the community.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5

Please continue answering Questions 2 and 3.	<u>Question 2</u> In your judgment, what weight <u>should be given</u> to each of the following factors in evaluating how well a teacher is carrying out his or her job? A = very great weight B = considerable weight C = some weight D = little weight E = no weight at all	<u>Question 3</u> In evaluating the teachers in your school, what weight <u>do you give</u>? 1 = very great weight 2 = considerable weight 3 = some weight 4 = little weight 5 = no weight at all
25. Degree of promptness in getting to classes.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
26. Enthusiasm for the school.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
27. Loyalty to the school administration.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
28. Degree of promptness in submitting reports.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
29. Extent to which they keep informed on new educational practices.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
30. Ability to adequately cover assigned course material during school year.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
31. Extent to which students respect the teachers.	A B C D E	1 2 3 4 5
-----	-----	-----

B-8

B-3: Instrument Used to Measure the Satisfaction Principals Derive
from Various Aspects of Their Work

To what degree do you enjoy each of the following aspects of a principal's role?

A = A great deal
B = Very much
C = Somewhat
D = Very little
E = Not at all
N = Aspect not relevant in
my particular situation

- [illegible]

B-4: Section of Teacher Questionnaire Used to Obtain Measures of the
Role Performance of Principals

Instructions		Col. I	Col. II
Listed below are some activities in which a PRINCIPAL can engage. Please answer Question 3 and Question 4 by writing in Col. I the <u>LETTER</u> and in Col. II the <u>NUMBER</u> which best represent your replies.			
Question 3 Do you feel the <u>PRINCIPAL OF YOUR SCHOOL</u> should engage in the following activities? I feel that the principal of my school. . . A = Absolutely must B = Preferably should C = May or may not D = Preferably should not E = Absolutely must not N = This activity not relevant to my school	Question 4 How frequently does your principal do this? My principal. . . 1 = Always 2 = Almost always 3 = Occasionally 4 = Almost never 5 = Never N = This activity not relevant to my school		
22. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.		☒	☒
24. Attempt to "redirect" the activities of the PTA or similar organizations that are beginning to question school practices.		☐	☐
25. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."		☐	☐
11. Give additional free time to teachers who are trying out new ideas in their classes.		(813)	(814)
13. Attempt to secure teachers in the school who are interested in experimenting with new educational ideas.		☒	☒
14. Encourage the introduction of curricular changes which he believes in even though there is little proof that the new curriculum will do a better job than the old one.		☐	☐
15. Encourage the staff to learn about and try out some of the "new ideas" coming from schools of education.		☐	☐
16. Encourage teachers to consider adopting new educational ideas which have been tried out in other communities and found to be successful.		☐	☐
17. Resist the introduction of a new educational method when he believes the current method is reasonably satisfactory.		☐	☐
18. Go slowly in introducing new techniques recommended by curriculum specialists.		☐	☐
19. Encourage schools of education to conduct experimental research in the school.		☐	☐
13. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.	Col. I ☐	Col. II ☐	
14. Attempt to restrict as much as possible the part parents play in school affairs.	☒	☒	
16. Discourage parental questioning of educational beliefs of faculty members.	☐	☐	
17. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.	☐	☐	
18. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.	☒	☒	
20. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.	☐	☐	
21. Devote considerable effort to developing or maintaining an active parents' organization in his school.	☐	☐	

	Col. I	Col. II		Col. I	Col. II
20. Make only those changes in teaching methods which are being introduced on a systemwide basis.	☐	☐	11. Support a teacher's discipline decision that the principal believes is grossly unfair to the child.	☐	☐
23. Seek out new ideas to introduce into the school's program.	☐	☐	14. Insist that students obey teacher's instructions first, and complain about them later.	☐	☐
-----	(815)	(816)	15. Side with the teacher when a student complains about the teacher's behavior, even if the student's complaint is legitimate.	☐	☐
11. Closely supervise new teachers in the school.	☐	☐	16. Be tolerant of older teachers if their teaching techniques are "poor."	☐	☐
12. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	☐	☐	17. Encourage worthwhile student activities that would require additional work by teachers.	☐	☐
13. Visit classes on a regular schedule to determine how well teachers are carrying out their jobs.	☐	☐	18. Avoid curricular changes that would strengthen the educational program, when the majority of the teachers oppose them.	☐	☐
16. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	☐	☐	22. Back the teacher in any public controversy between teacher and student.	☐	☐
17. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	☐	☐	23. Encourage teachers to give extra help in their "free" periods to students needing that help.	☐	☐
19. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	☐	☐	24. Correct a teacher in front of the students when he sees the teacher dealing with students unwisely.	☐	☐
20. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	☐	☐	26. Put the student's welfare above that of the teacher's when the two are opposed.	☐	☐
21. Limit supervisory activities primarily to those teachers with classroom problems.	☐	☐	-----	(819)	(820)
22. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	☐	☐	11. Avoid social involvement with groups of teachers.	☐	☐
26. Require teachers to keep the principal informed about "problem" children in their classrooms.	☐	☐	12. Spend an occasional evening with faculty members.	☐	☐
28. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	☐	☐	14. Encourage all teachers to call him by his first name, when students are not present.	☐	☐

Please continue answering Questions 3 & 4.		Col. I	Col. II
I feel that the principal of my school. . .	My principal. . . does this.		
A - Absolutely must	1 - Always		
B - Preferably should	2 - Almost always		
C - May or may not	3 - Occasionally		
D - Preferably should not	4 - Almost never		
E - Absolutely must not	5 - Never		
F - Not relevant	F - Not relevant		
	Col. I Col. II		
15. Make it a practice to have lunch frequently with the teachers in his school.	☐ ☐		
16. Discourage teachers from treating him as "one of the gang" at informal gatherings of teachers.	☐ ☐		
17. Follow the policy of not having members of the faculty as close personal friends.	☐ ☐		
19. Refrain from joining a social club to which a member of his teachers belong.	☐ ☐		
23. Discourage social invitations from faculty members.	☐ ☐		
24. Avoid first-name relationships with his teachers.	☐ ☐		
25. Insist, tactfully, that teachers show due respect for his position as principal.	☐ ☐		
21. Reprimand a faculty member who criticizes another faculty member or administrator in front of students.	☐ ☐		
22. Insist that arguments and discussions among school staff members be kept within the school family.	☐ ☐		
13. Expect an "off-duty" teacher to step in and help another teacher preserve order in an assembly or class group, when the teacher on duty is having some difficulty.	☐ ☐		
15. Require another teacher to fill in for a teacher who is late for school.	☐ ☐		
16. Expect that faculty members will stand behind the principal when he is under attack by parents on school matters.	☐ ☐		
17. Require that all teachers share in non-teaching duties.	☐ ☐		
20. Require teachers to stay after school occasionally to work on school projects unrelated to their teaching duties, but of benefit to the whole school.	☐ ☐		
21. Reprimand a teacher who publicly takes issue with school policies.	☐ ☐		
22. Insist that a teacher participate in a school program favored by a majority of teachers, even if the teacher has disagreed with it.	☐ ☐		
24. Reprimand a teacher who has a legitimate complaint against another teacher to do nothing about it, since it might create dissension in the school.	☐ ☐		
11. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining the minimum level of satisfactory student performance in your school.	☐ ☐		
12. Share with teachers the responsibility for evaluating how good a job the school is doing.	☐ ☐		
13. Share with teachers the responsibility for determining how teachers should be supervised.	☐ ☐		
14. Share with teachers the responsibility for developing a policy for handling student discipline problems.	☐ ☐		

Appendix C: Guttman Scales and Factor Weights Used in Measurement of Variables

We present here the Guttman scales used in this study and the factor weights of items (as well as their means and standard deviations) used in computing scores for variables descriptive of the principals' educational values, their reactions to role functions, their performance, and the functioning of their schools.

For the Guttman scales (Tables C-1 and C-2) we will present the item number, the definition of a positive response, the per cent of positive responses, and the frequency and per cent of item error for the entire sample of 501 principals in the National Principalship Study. We also will present the number and per cent of cases assigned to each perfect scale type. Although the distributions of non-scale types were tallied and checked for evidence of non-randomness, we will not report them here (there are seven perfect and 57 non-scale types for a six-item scale). The distribution of responses to items in the Level of Aspiration and Worry Instruments for the 189 elementary principals were presented in Chapters Four and Seven.

The other tables in the Appendix (Tables C-3 to Table C-24) present the wording of items, item means, standard deviations, and factor weights derived from factor analyses that were applied to the responses of principals or teachers to obtain scores to measure (1) the principals' educational values, (2) their reactions to their role functions; (3) their performance, and (4) organizational characteristics of their schools. The scores to measure the principals' educational values and reactions to work were based on factor weights derived from factor analyses of correlation matrices of the responses of the 501 principals in the

National Principalship Study. The correlation matrices on which the factor analyses were based resulting in the factor weights used in developing the measures of the principals' performance were reported in Chapter One, pp. 1-17 to 1-18; the correlation matrices on which the factor analyses were based resulting in the factor weights used in developing school scores on organizational characteristics were reported in Chapter Twelve. The correlation matrices which were factored and the details of the factor analyses, the varimax rotations, as well as the computation of factor score coefficients are not presented here in order to keep this appendix within reasonable limits and in view of the highly technical nature of these research activities. Readers who have a special interest in the more technical aspects of the factor analyses and Guttman scaling are encouraged to correspond with the authors directly.

Table C-1. Technical Details of Scale Construction: Level of Aspiration

Number of Useable Cases (N) = 501

Number of Items (m) = 6

I. Operational Definition of Scale

Item*	Definition of Positive Response*	Per Cent Positive Marginal	Frequency of Item Error (e)	Per Cent of Item Error
11	B, D, D, E	80.2	36.9	7.4
2	B, C, D, E	70.8	49.0	9.8
7	B, C, D, E	58.0	53.5	10.7
4	C, D, E	44.0	43.2	8.6
5	D, E	27.6	35.7	7.1
6	C, D, E	18.4	22.9	4.6

$$\text{Coefficient of Reproducibility} = 1 - \frac{E_s}{m(N)} = 1 - \frac{240}{5006} = .900$$

II. Distribution of Scale Scores

Ideal Response Pattern	Score	Frequency	Per Cent
++++++	6	54	10.8
+++++-	5	51	10.2
++++--	4	85	17.0
+++---	3	113	22.6
++-----	2	100	20.0
+-----	1	47	9.4
-----	0	50	10.0

* For wording of items and response alternatives see Table 4-5.

Table C-2. Technical Details of Scale Construction: Worry

Number of Useable Cases (N) = 500

Number of Items (m) = 6

I. Operational Definition of Scale

Item*	Definition of Positive Response*	Per Cent Positive Marginal	Frequency of Item Error (e)	Per Cent of Item Error
5	C, D, E	76.4	50.3	10.1
7	C, D, E	71.8	56.4	11.3
4	D, E	62.8	43.7	8.7
8	D, E	41.0	52.5	10.5
1	D, E	26.8	33.1	6.6
6	E	20.6	42.1	8.4

$$\text{Coefficient of Reproducibility} = 1 - \frac{E_e}{m(N)} = 1 - \frac{278}{3000} = .907$$

II. Distribution of Scale Scores

Ideal Response Pattern	Score	Frequency	Per Cent
++++++	6	49	9.8
+++++-	5	50	10.0
++++--	4	85	17.0
+++---	3	116	23.2
++----	2	111	22.2
+-----	1	41	8.2
-----	0	48	9.6

* For wording of items and response alternatives see Table 7-6.

Table C-3. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Concern with Differences Between Individual Pupils

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In evaluating a school such as yours, how much importance [(1) great importance, (2) some importance, (3) little importance, (4) no importance] should be given to such a criterion?			
1. The degree to which special provisions are made for the "slow learner."	1.37	0.55	-0.484
2. The degree to which special provisions are made for the "gifted child."	1.49	0.69	-0.442
3. The degree to which teaching materials in addition to textbooks are being used.	1.36	0.52	-0.422
4. The degree to which students work up to their capacities.	1.22	0.50	-0.296

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-4. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Attribute to the Academic Performance of Pupils

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In evaluating a school such as yours, how much importance [(1) great importance, (2) some importance, (3) little importance, (4) no importance] should be given to such a criterion?			
1. The success of former students in whatever educational institution they go to next.	1.65	0.72	0.579
2. The proportion of students who eventually go on to college.	2.19	1.02	0.527
3. The degree of student mastery of subject matter fundamentals.	1.33	0.56	0.465
4. The achievement test scores of students.	1.66	0.73	0.438

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-5. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Emphasis on the Presence of Delinquency-prone Pupils in the School

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In evaluating a school such as yours, how much importance [(1) great importance, (2) some importance, (3) little importance, (4) no importance] should be given to such a criterion?			
1. The proportion of students engaging in vandalism.	1.99	0.99	0.637
2. The proportion of students who are constant discipline problems.	1.92	0.95	0.633
3. The amount of student truancy.	1.91	0.88	0.588
4. The proportion of students who cheat.	1.91	0.97	0.576
5. The drop-out rate in the school.	1.86	0.87	0.505

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-6. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Concern for the Social and Emotional Development of the Child

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In evaluating a school such as yours, how much importance [(1) great importance, (2) some importance, (3) little importance, (4) no importance] should be given to such a criterion?			
1. The degree to which students exhibit <u>emotional</u> maturity.	1.77	0.86	-0.710
2. The degree to which students exhibit <u>social</u> maturity.	1.69	0.80	-0.678
3. The degree of tolerance toward fellow students of differing social backgrounds exhibited by students.	1.45	0.72	-0.451

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-7. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 185 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for Their Emphasis on the Discipline of Pupils

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In evaluating a school such as yours, how much importance [(1) great importance, (2) some importance, (3) little importance, (4) no importance] should be given to such a criterion?			
1. The degree to which teachers are able to maintain discipline in their classes.	1.20	0.42	-0.608
2. The degree to which students have respect for the teachers.	1.27	0.51	-0.469
3. The degree to which students exercise self-discipline.	1.28	0.52	-0.397

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-8. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Attribute to the Technical Skills of Teachers

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In your judgment, what weight [(1) very great weight, (2) considerable weight, (3) some weight, (4) little weight, (5) no weight at all] <u>should be given</u> to each of the following factors in evaluating how well a teacher is carrying out his or her job?			
1. Ability to make subject matter interesting to students.	1.32	0.51	-0.538
2. Comprehensiveness of lesson plans.	1.90	0.80	-0.428
3. Knowledge of subject matter.	1.38	0.54	-0.425

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-9. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Attribute to the Organisational Responsibility of Teachers

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
In your judgment, what weight [(1) very great weight, (2) considerable weight, (3) some weight, (4) little weight, (5) no weight at all] <u>should be given</u> to each of the following factors in evaluating how well a teacher is carrying out his or her job?			
1. Cooperation with school administration.	1.42	0.55	-0.592
2. Degree of promptness in submitting reports.	2.19	0.75	-0.574
3. Degree of promptness in getting to classes.	1.65	0.67	-0.548
4. Loyalty to the school administration.	1.79	0.79	-0.537
5. Dress and general appearance.	2.14	0.70	-0.517
6. Willingness to serve on committees of the school.	1.94	0.66	-0.463
7. Ability to maintain good relations with fellow teachers.	1.76	0.64	-0.456
8. Ability to maintain classroom discipline.	1.33	0.50	-0.424

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-10. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 136 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Assign to Managing the Instructional Program

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How important [(1) extremely important, (2) very important, (3) of moderate importance, (4) of little importance, (5) of no importance] do you view this activity in carrying out your job as principal of your school?			
1. Working on the improvement of the curriculum.	1.43	0.99	0.504
2. Introducing new teaching ideas.	1.64	0.67	0.488
3. Counselling pupils.	1.61	0.68	0.479
4. Carrying on in-service training programs for teachers.	1.68	0.73	0.458
5. Dealing with classroom problems of teachers.	1.45	0.61	0.451
6. Evaluating the performance of students.	1.74	0.79	0.433
7. Coordinating the work of teachers.	1.73	0.68	0.414
8. Conferring with individual teachers.	1.41	0.55	0.367

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-11. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 186 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Importance They Assign to Administrative Tasks

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How important [(1) extremely important, (2) very important, (3) of moderate importance, (4) of little importance, (5) of no importance] do you view this activity in carrying out your job as principal of your school?			
1. Keeping school records.	1.84	0.78	0.687
2. Checking school attendance.	2.01	0.86	0.651
3. Taking inventory of equipment.	2.63	0.80	0.616
4. Ordering or distributing supplies.	2.38	0.88	0.560
5. Preparing reports for the higher administration of the school system.	1.98	0.80	0.468
6. Checking grade sheets or report cards.	2.37	0.90	0.440
7. Planning students' schedules or class plans.	1.68	0.82	0.428
8. Dealing with correspondence.	2.30	0.79	0.428
9. Keeping a watch on the school budget.	1.89	0.82	0.426
10. Managing the school office.	2.17	0.81	0.425
11. Supervising the custodial staff.	2.40	0.83	0.356

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-12. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Self-assessment of Their Ability to Direct Instruction

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How would you rate your performance ((1) outstanding, (2) excellent, (3) good, (4) fair, (5) poor, (6) very poor) in each of the following areas?			
1. Getting <u>experienced</u> teachers to upgrade their performance.	3.10	0.83	-0.648
2. Improving the performance of <u>inexperienced</u> teachers.	2.79	0.79	-0.617
3. Getting teachers to use new educational methods.	2.96	0.74	-0.609
4. Giving leadership to the instructional program.	2.74	0.80	-0.592
5. Communicating the objectives of the school program to the faculty.	2.56	0.77	-0.565
6. Getting teachers to coordinate their activities.	2.78	0.71	-0.561
7. Knowing about the strengths and weaknesses of teachers.	2.36	0.77	-0.545
8. Maximizing the different skills found in a faculty.	2.59	0.81	-0.537

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-15. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Self-assessment of Their Administrative Abilities

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How would you rate your performance [(1) outstanding, (2) excellent, (3) good, (4) fair, (5) poor, (6) very poor] in each of the following areas?			
1. Keeping the school office running smoothly.	2.48	0.78	-0.674
2. General planning for the school.	2.57	0.74	-0.609
3. Directing the work of administrative assistants.	2.54	0.79	-0.472
4. Cutting "red-tape" when fast action is needed.	2.23	0.85	-0.396
5. Publicizing the work of the school.	2.97	0.93	-0.577

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-14. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Satisfaction They Derive from Managing the Instructional Program

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
To what degree do you enjoy [(1) a great deal, (2) very much, (3) somewhat, (4) very little, (5) not at all] each of the following aspects of a principal's role?			
1. Working with "exceptionally able" teachers.	1.57	0.67	0.625
2. Working with "average" teachers.	2.04	0.70	0.622
3. Working with new teachers.	1.62	0.68	0.541
4. Supervising the instructional program.	1.76	0.68	0.488
5. Working with curriculum specialists.	2.03	0.81	0.446
6. Having the freedom to schedule one's own time.	1.79	0.72	0.360
7. Having a vacation from work periodically during the school year.	1.71	0.80	0.340

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-15. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 189 Principals to Compute Factor Scores for the Satisfaction They Derive from Performing Administrative Tasks

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
To what degree do you enjoy [(1) a great deal, (2) very much, (3) somewhat, (4) very little, (5) not at all] each of the following aspects of a principal's role?			
1. Supervising office personnel.	2.61	0.80	0.635
2. Supervising custodial personnel.	3.05	0.89	0.610
3. Preparing reports to the higher administration.	3.07	0.94	0.601
4. Preparing staff bulletins or announcements.	2.87	0.84	0.498
5. Handling administrative routine.	2.30	0.99	0.486
6. Allocating the school budget.	2.84	0.94	0.469
7. Evaluating teacher performance.	2.83	0.97	0.460

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-16. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Control over Teachers' Professional Activities

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:			
1. Require that teachers discuss their major classroom problems with the principal.	3.76	0.85	0.630
2. Ask teachers to report all major conferences with parents to the principal.	3.55	0.90	0.593
3. Require teachers to keep the principal informed of "problem" children in their classrooms.	3.69	0.89	0.586
4. Closely direct the work of teachers who are likely to experience difficulty.	4.24	0.72	0.500
5. Require that teachers' classroom behavior conform to the principal's standards.	3.54	0.90	0.497
6. Check to see that teachers prepare written lesson plans.	3.58	0.93	0.463
7. Know what is taking place in most classrooms during most of the day.	3.72	0.82	0.393
8. Determine what the objectives of the guidance program should be in the school.	4.13	0.89	0.383

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-17. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Emphasis on Teacher Service to Pupils

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How frequently (always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)) does your principal:			
1. Encourage teachers to give extra help in their "free" periods to students needing that help.	2.03	0.84	0.413
2. Put the student's welfare above that of the teachers when the two are opposed.	2.35	1.12	0.410
3. Encourage worthwhile student activities that would require additional work by teachers.	2.30	0.77	0.406

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-18. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,305 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Support of Teachers in Conflict with Pupils

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:			
1. Side with the teacher when a student complains about the teacher's behavior, even if the student's complaint is legitimate.	2.97	1.12	0.693
2. Support a teacher's discipline decision that the principal believes is grossly unfair to the child.	2.41	1.15	0.580
3. Back the teacher in any public controversy between teacher and student.	3.94	0.88	0.572
4. Insist that students obey teacher's instructions first, and complain about them later.	4.06	0.92	0.373

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-19. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Social Distance in the School

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:			
1. Discourage teachers from treating him as "one of the gang" at informal gatherings of teachers.	2.34	1.05	0.579
2. Encourage all teachers to call him by his first name when students are not present.	3.51	0.95	-0.522
3. Make it a practice to have lunch frequently with the teachers in his school.	2.07	0.76	-0.470
4. Insist, tactfully, that teachers show due respect for his position as principal.	2.93	1.27	0.312

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-20. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Social Distance Outside the School

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:			
1. Discourage social invitations from faculty members.	2.50	0.94	0.638
2. Avoid social involvement with groups of teachers.	3.07	1.12	0.583
3. Refrain from joining a social club to which a number of his teachers belong.	2.51	1.01	0.577
4. Follow the policy of not having members of the faculty as close personal friends.	2.99	1.04	0.490
5. Spend an occasional evening with faculty members.	2.45	0.77	-0.437

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-21. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,303 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Their Principals' Parental Involvement

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
How frequently [always (5), almost always (4), occasionally (3), almost never (2), never (1)] does your principal:			
1. Encourage a group of parents to discuss and help formulate the educational philosophy to be used in the school.	3.35	1.01	0.609
2. Use interested parents as volunteer part-time "teacher helpers."	2.59	1.01	0.605
3. Encourage parents to help during school hours on school or class trips or projects.	3.66	0.88	0.598
4. Use interested parents as an advisory group when making out the course of study.	3.13	0.95	0.548
5. Encourage interested parent groups to evaluate how well the school is achieving its curricular objectives.	3.46	0.98	0.476
6. Encourage parental attendance at school assemblies.	3.63	0.78	0.441

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-22. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,235 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of the Professional Performance of Teachers

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
Of the teachers in your school, what per cent.....			
1. Are committed to doing the best job of which they are capable.	78.6	11.8	0.806
2. Maintain a professional attitude towards their work.	81.3	9.7	0.803
3. Maintain an interest in improving the educational program of the school.	73.0	14.7	0.803
4. Maintain effective discipline in their classes.	80.5	9.5	0.692
5. Usually "drag their feet" when new ideas are introduced into the school program.	22.9	11.4	-0.690
6. Try new teaching methods in their classrooms.	59.6	16.4	0.663
7. Do "textbook" teaching only.	24.7	13.6	-0.662
8. Waste a lot of time in their classroom activities.	18.9	11.1	-0.598

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-23. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 964 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Pupils' Performance

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
Of the pupils you teach, what per cent.....			
1. Are one or more years behind grade level in reading ability.	30.9	17.4	-0.802
2. Are not mastering the subject matter or skills you teach at the minimum level of satisfactory performance.	20.3	11.2	-0.787
3. Are not interested in academic achievement.	28.5	14.1	-0.771
4. Were not adequately prepared to do the grade level work expected of them when they entered your class(es).	31.2	14.9	-0.769
5. Work up to their intellectual capacities.	43.5	15.2	0.482

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.

Table C-24. Item Means, Standard Deviations, and Factor Weights Applied to the Responses of 1,235 Elementary School Teachers to Compute Factor Scores for Their Reports of Teachers' Morale

Item*	Mean	Standard Deviation	Factor Weight
Of the teachers in your school, what per cent.....			
1. Display a sense of pride in the school.	80.0	14.0	0.858
2. Enjoy working in the school.	79.5	13.6	0.825
3. Display a sense of loyalty to the school.	82.5	11.8	0.823
4. Respect the judgment of the administrators of the school.	76.1	14.8	0.782
5. Accept the educational philosophy underlying the curriculum of the school.	82.1	11.2	0.750
6. Work cooperatively with their fellow teachers.	84.7	8.5	0.689

* Items ordered in terms of decreasing magnitude of factor weight.